

The JOURNAL of
SOUTHERN
HISTORY

VOL. VIII

FEBRUARY, 1942

No. 1



Published quarterly by the
SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME VIII

FEBRUARY, 1942

NUMBER 1

Published Quarterly by
THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION



BOARD OF EDITORS

WALTER B. POSEY
Birmingham-Southern College

ROBERT S. COTTERILL
Florida State College for Women

PAUL H. BUCK
Harvard University

FLETCHER M. GREEN
University of North Carolina

W. NEIL FRANKLIN
The National Archives

ROBERT H. WOODY
Duke University

ELLA LONN
Goucher College

BELL I. WILEY
University of Mississippi

MANAGING EDITOR
FRED C. COLE, Louisiana State University

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATE
WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University

GUARANTOR
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY



Correspondence in regard to contributions to the *Journal* should be sent to the Managing Editor, Louisiana State University, University Station, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

The Southern Historical Association supplies the *Journal* to its members. The annual membership fee is three dollars; upon payment of fifty dollars, any person may become a life member. Single numbers of the *Journal* are available at seventy-five cents. Membership applications and checks should be sent to the Secretary-Treasurer.

The Southern Historical Association disclaims responsibility for statements made by contributors.

Entered as second-class matter April 5, 1935, at the Post Office at University Station, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME VIII FEBRUARY, 1942 NUMBER 1



Copyright, 1942, by the Southern Historical Association

CONTENTS

<i>The Colonial Status of the South.</i> By B. B. Kendrick	3
<i>A Private Soldier's Account of Washington's First Battles in the West; A Study in Historical Criticism.</i> By Hayes Baker-Crothers and Ruth Allison Hudnut	23
<i>The Seventh Annual Meeting of the Southern Historical Association.</i> By Thomas D. Clark	63
<i>Annual Report of the Secretary-Treasurer.</i> By James W. Patton	75
<i>Notes and Documents</i>	
Plotting after Harpers Ferry: The "William Handy" Letters. Edited by James C. Malin	81
Letters of Francis Kinloch to Thomas Boone, 1782-1788. Edited by Felix Gilbert	87
<i>Book Reviews</i>	
Abbey, <i>Florida, Land of Change</i> , by Isaac J. Cox	106
Henderson, <i>North Carolina: The Old North State and the New</i> , Vols. I and II, by R. S. Cotterill	108
Wright and Tinling, <i>The Secret Diary of William Byrd of Westover, 1709-1712</i> , by Wesley Frank Craven	110
Morton, <i>Robert Carter of Nomini Hall; A Virginia Tobacco Planter of the Eighteenth Century</i> , by Louis B. Wright	113
Brant, <i>James Madison, the Virginia Revolutionist</i> , by Thomas Perkins Abernethy	114
Brown, <i>Empire or Independence, A Study in the Failure of Reconciliation, 1774-1783</i> , by Philip Davidson	116
Carter, <i>The Territorial Papers of the United States</i> . Vol. IX, <i>The Territory of Orleans, 1803-1812</i> , by Walter Prichard	117
McCain, <i>Journals of the General Assembly of the Mississippi Territory, 1803</i> , by Minnie Clare Boyd	118
Demaree, <i>The American Agricultural Press, 1819-1860</i> , by Fletcher M. Green	119
Fulton, <i>Diary & Letters of Josiah Gregg; Southwestern Enterprises, 1840-1847</i> , by William Derrick Barns	121
Wilson, <i>Crusader in Crinoline: The Life of Harriet Beecher Stowe</i> , by Harvey Wish	122
Davenport, <i>Cultural Life in Nashville on the Eve of the Civil War</i> , by G. M. Capers, Jr.	123
Robinson, <i>Justice in Grey; A History of the Judicial System of the Confederate States of America</i> , by Robert D. Meade	125
Leech, <i>Reveille in Washington, 1860-1865</i> , by Edwin A. Davis	126
Kamm, <i>The Civil War Career of Thomas A. Scott</i> , by Harvey M. Rice	127
Swint, <i>The Northern Teacher in the South, 1862-1870</i> , by James W. Patton	128
Parks, <i>Charles Egbert Craddock (Mary Noailles Murfree)</i> , by Jay B. Hubbell	130
Handy, <i>Father of the Blues; An Autobiography</i> , by William R. Hogan	131
Florida Writers' Project, <i>Florida: A Guide to the Southernmost State</i> , by Kathryn Trimmer Abbey	132
Louisiana Writers' Program, <i>Louisiana: A Guide to the State</i> , by Garnie William McGinty	133
Maryland Writers' Program, <i>Maryland: A Guide to the Old Line State</i> , by Ella Lonn	134
Campbell, <i>Records of Rhea: A Condensed County History</i> , by Stanley J. Folmsbee	135
Bonner and Roberts, <i>Studies in Georgia History and Government</i> , by W. Edwin Hemphill	136
Knight, <i>Symbols of the South: Education and Early Life in Richmond under Tutorship of Miss "Jennie" Ellett</i> , by Wirt Armistead Cate	137
Kammer, <i>A Socio-Economic Survey of the Marshdwellers of Four Southeastern Louisiana Parishes</i> , by Vernon J. Parenton	138
<i>Communications</i>	139
<i>Historical News and Notices</i>	141
Personal	141
Historical Societies	143
Bibliographical	145
<i>Contributors</i>	158

The Colonial Status of the South

BY B. B. KENDRICK

If it is true that the South is "the Nation's No. 1 economic problem," the fundamental historical explanation of that condition is to be found in the fact that for more than three centuries this region, in greater or less degree, has occupied the status of a colony.¹ Generally colonials produce raw materials which they exchange on unfavorable terms with citizens of the imperial power for manufactured goods. As a result they fall increasingly into debt to those with whom they trade. Meanwhile, the outside creditors often invest some, or all, of their balances in the colonial area. These investments in the old days were mostly in agricultural real estate, enterprises for trapping and fur trading, and companies for the exploitation of timber and mineral wealth. Outsiders also generally owned the means of transportation and collected the freight on incoming and outgoing traffic. In the past seventy-five years, outside investments, while continuing in some of the older forms, have gone into internal transportation and communication companies, urban real estate and mortgages thereon, financial organizations and—perhaps of greatest importance today—into manufacturing. To this general pattern the South has almost perfectly conformed. At the present time the productive property of this region is largely owned by persons living outside its bounds. The fact that the owners are citizens of the same sov-

¹ This paper was read as the presidential address before the Southern Historical Association in Atlanta, November 7, 1941. The author wishes it understood that while he recognizes the necessity for complete national unity now that the country is at war, he sees no reason to modify any part of the interpretation he has placed upon events preceding the outbreak of war.

ereign nation as are the people of the South, has, in some manner, obscured the fact of the region's colonial status.

The purposes underlying this interpretative essay are: first, to suggest that the colonial status of the South might have been ended permanently by the American Revolution if, after that event, it had become an independent sovereignty instead of uniting with the Northeast in the United States of America under the Constitution of 1787; second, that having failed to take advantage of the opportunity offered by the so-called "Critical Period," it thereafter became too late to remedy the situation either by internal compromises or by secession; and third, to suggest that at present finance capitalism and imperialism hold the region in so firm a grip that no escape from the colonial status appears possible short of some catastrophic collapse of the whole imperialistic system.

Even as early as 1600, the rising middle classes in Great Britain were aware that it was a good deal more profitable to engage in manufacturing, shipping, and buying and selling than it was in producing raw materials. This awareness explains why persons of the middle class should have concerned themselves with the establishment of an American colonial empire. In the colonies the "superfluous" populations of England and other western European countries could be put to work producing raw materials which were sold at a low price to merchants, transported for a good profit by shipowners, fabricated with considerable gain to manufacturers, and resold at home, abroad, and to the colonists at a dear price, again by the merchants. It would be unfair to imagine for a moment that the gentlemen adventurers who established the London Company to carry into practical effect these ideas were in any sense parasitical. As a matter of fact, without their initiative, enterprise, and willingness to take a gambler's chance, the colonization of America would have been long delayed. History records that these first adventurers actually lost most of the money they advanced. But in the long run English merchants as a class did gain not only from the Virginia colony but also from the four other plantations which by 1733 dotted the Atlantic coast from the Chesapeake Bay to the St. Mary's River.

Between 1607 and 1776, there elapsed 169 years—a period slightly longer than that since 1776. During these five or six generations, there evolved in the South some colonists who became owners of broad acres and many slaves. But these southern landowners who grew tobacco or rice for Old World markets, and in addition shipped abroad timber, naval stores, and a variety of other raw materials, were always aware that they were netting but little beyond a fair living from their investments and their entrepreneurial efforts. Year by year their debts increased until on the eve of the Revolution, Thomas Jefferson could say truthfully of himself and his neighbors that they were merely “a species of property, annexed to certain mercantile houses in London.” And later Oliver Wolcott could say: “It is a firmly established opinion of men well versed in the history of our revolution, that the Whiggism of Virginia was chiefly owing to the debts of the planters.” Over a century later, the historical researches of Arthur Meier Schlesinger and other scholars largely corroborated the truth of Jefferson’s and Wolcott’s statements.

One of the first sovereign acts of the new states was the confiscation of debts to British merchants and the expropriation of the property of British subjects, including that of native Tories. This exercise of the power to confiscate, be it noted, was one method employed by the colonial planters and merchants to escape from their colonialism. In New England and the Middle States the escape was permanent. Moreover, by gaining control of the commercial and financial policies of the new general government the merchants, manufacturers, shipowners, and money-lenders of those states were eventually able to replace the similar groups in England in the exploitation of producers of raw materials and agricultural products not only in their own area but also in the South. Therefore, since the Southerners were destined for at least another century to continue as almost entirely agricultural producers and as purchasers of fabricated articles, it can be argued that it would have been better for the region to have relied principally upon Old England instead of upon New England as a source of supply of manufactured goods. For a century at least, Old England could have sold the South

better goods for less money than New England was able to do. The terms of trade would have been unfavorable in either case, but it is more than probable that they would have been somewhat less so had the southern states remained economic dependencies of Great Britain.

From this it does not follow that the revolt of the South against England was not entirely justifiable on other grounds, for it was both reasonable and just for the members of the southern elite to desire for themselves honorable positions in social and political life. This understandable and natural ambition was an even more dynamic factor than debts in transforming such fundamental conservatives as the Habershams, the Pinckneys, the Johnsons, the Washingtons, and the Carrolls into revolutionists. Moreover, it was right, that, in consultation with their constituents, they should wish to formulate and direct their own domestic and foreign policies without regard to British Tory interests and opinions. Since a war was necessary for them to attain their objectives they were wise to ally themselves with their neighbors to the north and with France in order to assure the winning of that war.

But their northern neighbors and the French monarchy were actuated by a different set of motives from their own. With the latter, they entered into a military alliance which the French hoped and expected would eventuate in their becoming dependencies of France instead of England, when once the war was over. In this expectation the Gallic ally, as is well known, was disappointed. With the North, the South made a verbal compact, later formalized in the Articles of Confederation, which rendered mutual assistance possible without calling into question the sovereignty of the states. When commercial, financial, and speculative interests found this loose federation too weak to serve their purposes and began moving for a stronger central government, the Southerners should have been as wary of them as they had been of the British and French.

The foregoing statement brings up the delicate question of "historical relativity." "Historical relativity" places the historian dealing with the actions of men of a past epoch under obligation to do so not in the light of his own time but in that of the era with which he is concerning him-

self. Some thirty years ago, Charles A. Beard in his *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution* and his subsequent *Economic Origins of Jeffersonian Democracy* proved to the satisfaction of most open-minded students that, in large measure, the Constitution was the handiwork of a revolutionary minority bent upon safeguarding and promoting the interests of commercial, manufacturing, and financial groups. Such groups were located almost entirely in the North, but they received the support and temporary alliance of southern plantation owners and speculators in western lands.

The keen political instinct of small farmers in general, and of the piedmont South in particular, warned them that the newly proposed Federal government would not be to their benefit. In North Carolina the small farmers were able to prevent ratification on the first test, while in Virginia they might have been successful in doing so had not some of their delegates, when subjected to pressure in the convention, apparently regarded their election promises as mere "campaign oratory." Even in South Carolina and Maryland their opposition was well known and articulate. In Georgia, where a temporarily exposed position made fear a predominant emotion, there seems to have been little opposition to the new and stronger union; but Georgia counted for but little at that time, and in the end would have followed the lead of her four more northerly neighbors had she received such a lead.

According to Beard, some of the plantation owners stood for alliance with other propertied groups because they were suspicious of the radical tendencies of their own Westerners. In the light of their own time and the experiences they had had with the British merchants, it seems reasonable to assume that they should have feared the western radicals less and the northern businessmen more, since these latter were little different from similar groups in England and Scotland. Indeed, some few southern leaders did just that. For instance, John Mason and Patrick Henry in Virginia, and Willie Jones and William Lenoir in North Carolina opposed ratification. But the influence of men like Washington and Madison outweighed these latter.² The influence of such men must

² With regard to Madison it is only fair to point out that, as revealed in his master-

have been out of all proportion to their numbers, and while it is to their credit that they were able to take a large view of the situation, it was not in the long run advantageous to themselves, their class, or their section that they did so. Doubtless, some of them hoped and expected that the South would become relatively as much a commercial, industrial, and financial section as the North.⁸

Were there good grounds for such hope? Had they been able to concentrate on just two facts, it seems that they should have answered this question in the negative. The first of these facts was the slave system, which by that time was firmly fixed on the South, despite the opinion of some historians who believe that only the evolution of cotton culture on a grand scale made the continuation of the slave system inevitable. Actually the Southerners were habituated to the institution and would have been loath to part with it even had they been convinced that it was financially unprofitable. This attitude can be accounted for partly by the fact that the question was more social than economic at almost all times, as the late Ulrich B. Phillips perhaps overemphasized. Since a good part of southern capital had to go into the ownership of labor, it could hardly have been expected that there would be much left over for commercial, manufacturing, and financial enterprises.

The second fact is that, other things being equal, men follow the line of least resistance. Even in the 1780's everyone knew that the South had an almost limitless hinterland adaptable to the slave-plantation system, and that such capital as might be accumulated would necessarily go into the exploitation of this hinterland. The historical accident that the land claims of wealthy Virginians were mostly north of the Ohio,

piece, "Federalist, Number 10," no other man of his time perceived so clearly the influence of economic interests upon political principles and actions. Apparently his own intellectual honesty led him to believe that the Constitution would always be interpreted *strictly* and that the United States government would remain *federal* in a sense opposite to *central* or *national*.

⁸ It is interesting to speculate on the position Jefferson would have taken on the Constitution had he been in the country in 1787-1788. It seems that consistency and his keen distrust of the "economic royalists" of his time would have demanded that he oppose it, had he been present. That he could have opened Madison's eyes (as he did later) to the danger latent in the Constitution is also probable. Together Jefferson and Madison, in all likelihood, could have prevented southern ratification.

rather than south of it, may have been determining, but of that no one can be sure.

By way of summary it may be said that indeed the decade of the 1780's was a "Critical Period." But for the South it was "critical" in a sense exactly opposite to that in which the phrase was employed by John Fiske a century later. Fiske as a philosophical representative of and spokesman for industrial and commercial interests saw that what did in fact take place very well *might not* have done so, and such an eventuality would have been "bad" for the system for which he was an intellectual spokesman. To the South the period was "critical" because what did happen was "bad," while the establishment of a separate southern confederacy at that time would have been "good."⁴

Had the Constitution of 1787-1789 not been ratified by the southern states it is almost a certainty that the eight states to the north of Maryland, and perhaps Maryland too, eventually would have provided themselves with a constitution substantially identical with *the* Constitution we know. Indeed, that very Constitution might well have gone into effect, for by its own terms it provided that it would become operative when ratified by nine states. Had Virginia steadfastly refused to ratify, it can readily be assumed that in a relatively short time she would have been joined by the two Carolinas and Georgia in establishing a southern confederacy. We may be sure that such a confederacy would have been aggressively expansionist and would have obtained Florida, Louisiana, Texas, and California in an even shorter time than they were actually secured by the United States. Be it remembered that it was the South which furnished the driving force for making these acquisitions when

⁴ The terms "good" and "bad," "right" and "wrong," are employed throughout this paper in no moral sense. Whether such moral or ethical "goods" as the greater glory of God, democracy, human happiness as a whole, or even the "greatest good for the greatest number" were promoted or retarded by the Constitution no one can say with certainty. In general, historians, even including southern historians, have proceeded on the assumption that all these ethical "goods" were served by the Constitution. With this assumption it is not necessary to quarrel. Using the words as terms in social dynamics then, rather than in morality or ethics, it may be stated that the Constitution was "good" for the development of a system of capitalism in which control is concentrated in relatively few hands, and "bad" for a system of agricultural and other small tangible personal property interests in which control is widely dispersed.

the Northeast was holding back. The southern confederacy would have provided by advantageous trade treaties for the sale of its agricultural and other raw materials in whatever markets seemed most desirable. That cotton, tobacco, and rice would have gone to northern markets in payment for fabricated materials is certain, but such trade would have been on much more favorable terms than was actually the case. The bulk of southern commerce, however, would have been with Great Britain and the countries of northwest Europe, for the reason that for a long time, at least, these countries manufactured better and cheaper consumers' goods than did the North. Moreover, there would have been few if any tariff duties to pay on imports, with the result that the differential between prices paid and prices received would not have been nearly so great as it actually was. In short, a separate confederate government would have harmonized much better with the economic and social life of the region than did that of the United States. And, *pari passu*, it can with almost equal certainty be maintained that the government of the United States, with the South out of it, would have harmonized with greater precision with the life of the northern region. Finally, the relations between North and South would have been much more peaceful and mutually respectful had each been an independent sovereignty from the start. This can be said if for no other reason than that it is hard to conceive of such relations being *worse* than they actually were during the long years lying between the enunciation and adoption of Hamilton's financial policies in 1789-1791 and the withdrawal of Federal troops from Louisiana and South Carolina in 1877. In fact, it is reasonable to suppose that there would have been no greater ill feeling and squabbling between the two countries than actually existed between the United States and Canada. The Potomac-Ohio line formed a fairly natural boundary on this side of the Mississippi, while the western boundary probably could have been fixed as well by treaty as was that between Canada and the United States in 1846.⁵

⁵ In this connection it may be stated with some dogmatism that relations with Canada would not have been so pleasant had that dominion once been a part of the United States and afterwards have established its independence.

If we think of the adoption of the Constitution as a marriage between the two sections, we may consider the Revolution as a period of friendship formed for the duration of a common danger, while to the Confederation period we may assign the status of a formal engagement. Just as it is usually much less tragic to break an engagement than to dissolve a marriage, so likewise it would have been better for the South never to have entered into a union with the North than later to have sought a dissolution. Perhaps the same excuse may be made for her action as is sometimes made for a young bride—namely, that she was not aware of the seriousness of the step she was taking. Certainly if she had married in haste, there was ample leisure for repentance. And repentance began immediately.

With this remark we turn now to consider the second purpose of this paper, which is an examination of the question: Was a compromise of the interests of the two sections possible under the Constitution, and if not, was subsequent separation feasible? That the South was yoked in an unequal union became apparent with the adoption of the Hamiltonian financial schemes, aimed as they were at enriching and strengthening the commercial, industrial, and, above all, the financial interests which were concentrated in the larger cities of New England and the Middle States. It is true that Hamilton rationalized that these measures would be beneficial to small property and agricultural interests as well, but just here began that disingenuous sophistry which to this day has characterized spokesmen for business interests and which more straightforward and forthright persons have found so difficult to parry.⁶ Of almost equal importance in aggrandizing commercial and financial interests at the expense of agricultural interests in general and of the South in particular, was the pro-British foreign policy of the Federalists. Already the moneyed men of the northern cities were linking their destinies with those of similar groups in England, who, since the days of the Glorious Revolution, had largely controlled the financial and foreign policies of the motherland. With these policies the Federalists

⁶ Splendid examples of the two types of argument are Hamilton's memorandum in support of the constitutionality of the Bank of the United States and Jefferson's in opposition.

pursued one which recently we have called "parallel action." Name this reason or instinct, it was sound. Equally sound was the pro-French attitude of most Southerners, for the French Revolution had proclaimed undying hatred of monopoly of all sorts and everlasting devotion to "security, liberty, property, and resistance to oppression." And for "property" we may read "small, tangible, real and personal property"—that is, the sort to which the South was devoted. In other words, both sides seem to have recognized their friends and enemies when they saw them.

To the leadership of the Republicans now came Jefferson, seconded by Madison, Monroe, and lesser leaders. If we return for a moment to our engagement, marriage, and divorce figure, we may with propriety lay down the further elaboration of it by saying that if there is to be a divorce at all, it is better for it to come soon—preferably before there are any children (in this case, new states) to complicate matters. Jefferson had the choice of two policies. Either he could undertake to rally agrarian and small-property classes in the North to unite with his southern constituents to capture the central government and undo the Federalist policies, or he could disregard any potential allies in the North and endeavor to commit the South to separation. Indeed, Jefferson could and perhaps did regard these procedures not merely as alternatives but as sequential. That is to say, if the former should fail, he could fall back on the latter. There is no doubt that his personal preference was for the former, but that he was willing to resort to secession the Kentucky Resolutions of 1799 seem to attest. It is extremely doubtful, however, whether Jefferson would have led a southern secession movement had he and his party failed of victory in 1800. Hamilton's estimate of Jefferson—that he was a man bold in theory but timid in action—is probably correct. And this estimate of Jefferson is even more true of his closest associate and successor, Madison. The compromising character of the administrations of both men as well as that of the third member of the triumvirate, Monroe, is further proof that the Virginia hegemony was Girondin in character and not Jacobin, as some Federalist contemporaries professed to believe.

Not only did Jefferson and his successors fail to undo most of the special privileges that the Federalists had bestowed upon the business interests, but before Madison's second administration was over the protective tariff principle had been firmly established, and the Second Bank of the United States, much stronger and more monopolistic than the first, had been chartered. This weak leadership, after having made a great show of kicking special privilege out the parlor door, was responsible for allowing it to sneak back through the kitchen door. So far had this process gone that in 1824 the John Quincy Adams-Henry Clay coalition gained possession of the government in the name of National Republicanism! For this denouement, in addition to the timid character of the Virginia leadership, two other factors were responsible: (1) Most of the younger Federalists, despairing of rejuvenating their party after its unheroic conduct in the War of 1812, went over to the Republicans carrying with them their Federalist principles. (2) Many of Jefferson's northern lieutenants were beginning to embrace such principles in response to the improving economic and social status of themselves and some of their constituents. The two groups quickly fused and formed a veritable "fifth column" within the Republican body.⁷ From this point of vantage they were able to "bore from within" as the modern Communist phrase has it, and to play the ancient Roman game of *divide et impera*. For this game the abolitionists furnished bats, balls, and gloves, while good diamonds were found in the Louisiana Purchase and later in the Mexican Cession.

So much has been said about the antislavery movement—its origins, motives, and progress—that it would be supererogation to attempt here any original contribution to the discussion. For the purposes of this paper, however, it is necessary to make two or three observations on the subject. The antislavery movement sprang from two sources. In the first place, it was a handy and, in most cases, a relatively inexpensive method

⁷ That Jefferson himself was not unaware of what was going on is attested by a letter he wrote in 1822 to Albert Gallatin and another in 1824 to Martin Van Buren. In the former he said: "Do not believe a word of it [that the lion and the lamb are lying down together]. The same parties exist now as ever did." In the letter to Van Buren he wrote: "Tories are Tories still, by whatever name they be called."

for members of a conscientious nonslaveholding middle class to pay their debts to God. Long before 1800 Quakers and similar sects had begun so to employ it. It was none other than the very moral John Stuart Mill who first made the observation that morality is primarily a middle-class virtue. The poor, said Mill, *cannot* afford to be moral whereas the rich *can* afford *not* to be. Like every other aphorism of general significance this one has plenty of exceptions in its specific application. The general truth of Mill's statement, however, is reasonably apparent. Members of antislavery societies were drawn almost exclusively from groups who, economically, were small property owners and who, religiously, stemmed from seventeenth century English Puritanism—itself a middle-class movement.

In the second place, slavery collided head on with the eighteenth century dogma, so eloquently incorporated into our Declaration of Independence in the ringing phrases: "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness." This egalitarianism was taken seriously everywhere by small property owners, but in the South it was applied in fact, even from the first, only to whites, and also in theory after the formulation and general acceptance of the proslavery argument. In the North, on the other hand, where the social problem of the Negro was either nonexistent or not acute, egalitarianism had no need to draw the color line. Indeed, the devotees of the dogma in that section came eventually to assert that the genuine article could be distinguished from the spurious by subjecting it to what we may call the color test. So far did this conceit go that even the author of the immortal Declaration himself came to be suspected and, by the extremists, openly accused, of blackhearted hypocrisy. Even before his death it was already apparent to the more discerning, including perhaps Jefferson himself, that a wedge in the shape of the slavery controversy was being driven between his followers in the North and those in the South. The point here is that while financial and industrial capitalists and their political henchmen did not forge the wedge, when

they saw it already entering the body of the Jeffersonians, they did not neglect to give it some mighty mauling. *Divide et impera*.

In cleaving the body of Jeffersonianism the financial and industrial groups did not intend to rive the body of the Union. So much "aid short of war" had they given to the abolitionists, however, that by 1860 the latter were able to drive the wedge home and split asunder not only the body of Jeffersonianism but also that of the Union itself. And so had ended in failure the effort begun by Jefferson and continued by other apostles of small property to create and maintain on a national scale a party which could and would hold in check the overgrown pretensions and overweening ambitions of the party of special privilege. That is to say, it had proved impossible to prevent industry and finance from becoming the mistresses instead of remaining, as the Jeffersonians desired, the handmaidens of agriculture and commerce.

During few if any of the first seventy years of the Federal Republic were the terms of trade between the South and the industrial and financial centers of the North in favor of the former. The colonialization of the South was proceeding slowly but surely. During the first fifty of these years it was mainly in the older sections of the South that the pinch was felt acutely. During these years, indeed, it was the existence of a vast southern hinterland into which the more hard-pressed citizens of the older South could escape that prevented such near-crises as the Nullification and Wilmot Proviso controversies from becoming real crises. In the last twenty years of the period the pinch tended to become widespread throughout the region. It was during this time that southern leaders came to adopt two policies as sequential: (1) further extension of the southern hinterland; and in case of the failure of this policy to fall back on (2) secession and an independent southern confederacy which they believed could prevent the bankruptcy which stared many of their constituents in the face. Add to this the obloquy and contumely in which Southerners were held by many of the "best" people of the North, and there remains no wonder that the stroke for southern independence was finally made.⁸

⁸ It should be pointed out in this connection that the source of inspiration for the rising

It was the British historian and publicist Lord Acton who once undertook to compress the nature of the American Civil War into an aphorism. "Secession," ran the noble saw, "was an aristocratic rebellion against a democratic government." Except for the fact that a relatively few large plantation owners gave tone to and, in some degree, controlled social and political life in the South, and hence lent color to the aristocratic picture, the almost exact opposite of the Acton dictum is the truth. There is no need to labor this point, but it is pertinent to stress the fact that democracy, as a social and political system, arose with and flourished upon that sort of capitalism where private property was widely distributed, individually owned, and personally managed.⁹ This was the character of the southern economic system previous to 1860. Even the so-called "poor whites" were seldom tenants. Manufactories, commercial enterprises, and financial institutions conformed to the pattern as well as did farms and plantations. Absentee ownership in any of these sorts of business was the exception rather than the rule. But as has been already emphasized, the South, even when its influence in Washington was considerable, was never able to control the terms of its domestic and foreign trade nor the money system in which trade was carried on. Consequently a new colonialism was taking place. But unity in the South, although greater in 1860 than ever before, was still far from complete. This lack of unity was the most important single factor contributing to the ultimate defeat of the South.

northern literati (especially those of New England) came to be the antislavery crusade. In addition to the preachers whose service of God was more and more equated with opposition to slavery, the theme song of the orators, poets, essayists, and novelists was subsequently expressed by Mrs. Howe in the lines:

In the beauty of the lilies
Christ was born across the sea,
With a glory in his bosom that transfigures you and me;
As he died to make men holy, let us die to make men free,
While God is marching on.

Under such circumstances a "holy" war was inevitable. Sooner or later moderate men would be in a hopeless minority and be castigated as Copperheads—the "Appeasers" of that day. The comparison *is not* mine.

⁹ Conversely, democracy as a way of social and political life may well be doomed when ownership and management is highly concentrated in the impersonal corporate form.

There is a tide in the affairs of men,
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
Omitted, all the voyage of their life
Is bound in shallows and in miseries.

The flood tide of 1787 was omitted: and the voyage which before the Civil War was "bound in shallows and in miseries," has since that event continued to be so bound.

For a decade or more after the Civil War the North undertook to rule the "conquered provinces" of the South by means of northern adventurers and southern "loyalists" whose political power rested upon universal Negro suffrage. Such rule needed to be buttressed constantly by Federal military force, for the "political potential" of Carpetbaggers, Scalawags, and Negroes was not equal to that of the former Confederates even in their pitifully weakened postwar condition. Such immature, brutally direct, and crassly inept imperialism, however camouflaged by such propaganda terms as "equality," "democracy," and "loyalty," sooner or later was bound to antagonize a sufficient number of nonimperialist elements in the North as to spell its doom. And so it happened in 1877. The significance of the great compromise of that year turned out to be this: No longer would the northern imperialists undertake to rule the South by their own henchmen; on their part, the native southern elite would guarantee the protection of northern imperialist interests in the region.

This more mature policy worked exceedingly well. During the following half century, ownership of transportation, communication, financial, manufacturing, mining, and finally distributing corporations came to be largely held in the great cities of the Northeast, especially New York. Northern corporations and individuals owned most of the certificates of public indebtedness issued by the states, counties, and municipalities of the South. Likewise mortgages on southern agricultural and urban property were largely held in the North. The profits on the insurance business done in the South were channeled off to New England and New York. While the total number of businessmen in the South was ever increasing, the proportion who were independent own-

ers of small businesses was constantly decreasing. In short, southern businessmen were becoming mere agents and factors for northern principals. In the last quarter century the process has been accelerated. The World War, the era of "Coolidge Prosperity," the depression of the 1930's—each in its own way was a contributory factor. Today the subordination of all ordinary production to "defense" production, concentrated as it is in a few score great corporations, threatens the final ruin of such small businesses as still remain.

With the major part of income derived from profits, dividends, interest, and rent being siphoned out of the region to dwellers in the metropolises of the Northeast, the southern people were left to live mainly on wages, salaries, commissions, and other forms of income of similar nature. From studies made by Clarence Heer and others we know that these types of income were low in the South, relative to similar sorts of income outside this region. Necessarily this was so, not only because of the drain occasioned by payment of "invisible" items, but also because the South continued to be primarily a producer of raw materials and the coarser types of manufactured goods. This meant that the prices for which agricultural commodities were sold were much lower than prices paid for fabricated articles. In short, the southern people were obliged to work relatively more and more for less and less.

By the mid-1920's the second cycle of southern colonialism had made full revolution. The articulate political people of the South were the businessmen. To them the press and professions were largely subservient. In maintaining their ascendancy they were greatly aided by all sorts of national associations of businessmen, such as chambers of commerce, so-called service clubs, and the like. The policies promulgated by such organizations emanated largely, if not entirely, from the great centers of finance capitalism and imperialism. The burden of their propaganda was that the interests of all businessmen were parallel to, if not identical with, those of the financiers. On a national scale the magazines, the movies, and finally the radio carried the propaganda of the vested interests into almost every nook and cranny of the land. In the Northeast and especially in the West there was considerable organized

opposition to the avalanche, but in the South there was almost none. Hence we are confronted with a paradox more amazing and ironical than any ever conjured by the imagination of Gilbert and Sullivan. The people of the South, who all their lives had suffered deprivation, want, and humiliation from an outside finance imperialism, followed with hardly a murmur of protest leaders who, if indirectly, were nonetheless in effect agents and attorneys of the imperialists. Even our "Good Neighbors" and "Sister Democracies" to the south of us have never taken their medicine in so prone a position. Here from Virginia to Texas, the Glasses and the Garners strove to "out-Mellon" Mellon. Never before in the history of this country had a single group so fully dominated public policy as did the finance capitalists during the "Golden Twenties." And nowhere was their dominance more complete than in their southern "colony."

That their direct rule was at least temporarily halted in the 1930's was not due to the activities of a well-organized opposition, but to the confusion into which the financiers were thrown by the utter failure of their own most cherished principles to work satisfactorily even for themselves. As a result, the election of 1932 brought into control of the Federal government a more strangely assorted group of men than Washington had seen since its establishment as the nation's capital. Under the spreading New Deal tent were gathered, from left to right, Communists, State Socialists, other varieties of Marxists, delegates from the camps of both radical and conservative labor, old-fashioned Democrats speaking for agriculture and small business, many kinds of reformers, representatives of the political "rings" of the great northern cities, and even a few "money-changers" whom Mr. Roosevelt had pledged himself to "scourge from the temple"—into the treasury, as it eventually turned out. To these multicolored groups the southern Democrats were added by the exigencies of party politics.

Obviously among men of so many "principles" the only one which in the long run could serve as a cohesive force was the "principle" of continuity in office. For nearly five years political power was maintained by promoting the three R's of Recovery, Relief, and Reform with that

age-old mechanism of governments for escaping from domestic difficulties—a vigorous foreign policy, lurking more or less consciously in the minds of some New Dealers in case the three R's should fail them. Toward the recovery and relief measures, practical politics, and doubtless in many instances personal conviction, demanded that the southern politicians assume a friendly attitude. On the other hand, many of them either openly opposed or secretly undertook to sabotage the reform bills.

This concluding excursus into contemporary history, however, is taken not to discuss New Deal domestic policy in relation to the South but in order to raise the question whether it has effected any fundamental change in the colonial status of the South by indicating the attitude of southern politicians toward the recent imperialist foreign policy of the New Deal.

When the "recession" of 1937 and the failure of the Court "packing" bill in the same year made it apparent to the "inner circle" of New Dealers that their days of rule were numbered if they continued to confine their attention to domestic issues, they began to seek new means of attracting support. In this quest, events, and more important, *the popularly accepted interpretation of events*, played into their hands. By 1937 the regime of the Nazis in Germany, generally detested in this country from its beginning, had become so aggressive as to be a matter of grave concern to several social and economic groups in America. Among these were the national and international finance capitalists and imperialists; the Anglophiles who included in their number most of the "best" people; except for some of the Irish, Italians, and "Aryan" Germans, immigrants and their offspring who still had a strong emotional and cultural tie with their European kinsmen; most "liberal" journalists, publicists, and social scientists; moralists, who could see "sin" written all over the countenances of the leading Nazis; and except during the period of the Hitler-Stalin pact, Communists and their numerous "fellow-travelers."

The signal that the foreign policies of American Continentalism and Pan-Americanism, to which the New Deal administration had previously adhered, were to be superseded by a policy of death to Japanese and German dictatorships, to be made effective ultimately by means of

an Anglo-American alliance, was sounded by the President's Chicago "quarantine" speech in October, 1937. By what devious roads the New Deal band wagon traveled from Chautauqua to Chicago to London and finally to Moscow need not detain us. It is important to note, however, that at various points along that road all those groups just enumerated—many of them formerly wayside scoffers—climbed aboard. It is also significant that they took with them most of the powerful propaganda agencies sorely needed to convert the American people to the view that national defense, with which no one could quarrel, was identical with intervention. Some of the groups were content to let the New Deal do the driving, but the imperialists and the Communists each hoped and expected to sit in the driver's seat before the journey's end.¹⁰

Of chief interest to us, however, is the fact that it was our own region which furnished the greatest amount of the political power necessary for the achievement of the revolution in New Deal foreign policy. This is clearly revealed by the vote in Congress on the crucial first Lease-Lend bill passed in the spring of 1941. For purposes of analysis, the country may be divided roughly into three sections: (1) The Northeast, consisting of the six New England states and the five Middle Atlantic states; (2) the South, consisting of the eleven ex-Confederate states, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Oklahoma; and (3) the West, consisting of the other twenty-three states. The vote on the bill by houses and sections follows.

SENATE			
<i>Section</i>	<i>For</i>	<i>Against</i>	<i>Absent or Not Voting</i>
Northeast	16	6	0
South	25	1	2
West	20	25	1
TOTALS	61	32	3
HOUSE			
Northeast	81	46	2
South	119	5	1
West	61	119	1
TOTALS	261	170	4

¹⁰ That there will be a fierce struggle for control between the New Deal and imperialist interventionists at or near the end of the war may be predicted with a high degree of certainty. It will be interesting to see which side will secure the support of southern politicians.

Had the Southerners voted on the bill in the same proportion as the Westerners, it would have barely passed in the Senate and would have been defeated in the House by a substantial majority. Likewise, most other interventionist bills have become laws because of overwhelming southern support. Why this southern belligerency? This question raises many others, which are not answerable at this time, but at least two may be presented now for future consideration. They are: (1) Is it not conceivable that the huge southern majority for Lend-Lease and other interventionist measures indicates that the finance capitalists and imperialists who receive so much of the South's social income exercise an even greater political power in their "colony" than they do in their own bailiwicks? (2) Does it not appear from even a casual acquaintance with the propaganda of the American imperialists that they believe they must survive or perish with their confreres who direct the destinies of the British Empire? Lack of perspective and adequate information as well as a decent regard for the proprieties and the claims of patriotism demand that answers to these two questions be postponed until a time more calm and propitious to the researches of the objective historian.

Meanwhile, it may not be out of order to remember that it was long ago said, "whom the gods would destroy they first make mad." We do not know with whom the military victory will ultimately rest or who will be in the driver's seat when it is won, lost, or drawn. But it has been suggested, and not without some reason, too, that no matter what the outcome, finance capitalism and imperialism is doomed. If this prove true, then the objective historian in that more propitious time may well record with Socratic irony that those Southerners who sought to serve an opposite purpose, did in fact all unwittingly unloose the chains which bound the South to an ancient and enervating colonialism.

A Private Soldier's Account of Washington's First Battles in the West; A Study in Historical Criticism

BY HAYES BAKER-CROTHERS AND RUTH ALLISON HUDNUT

I AFFIDAVIT

His Excellency the Governor Communicated to the Board the following Affidavit of John Shaw concerning the Attempts of the French to Interrupt the Tranquility of the Inhabitants of Virginia.¹

Before me James Glen Esquire Governor and Commander in Chief in and over his Majesty's province of South Carolina Personally appeared John Shaw, who being duely Sworn on the Holy Evangelists, & Made Oath, That he was born in the City of Dublin in the Kingdom of Ireland, That he is of the Age of Twenty Years and upwards that he has used the Seas Severall Years, That he was a Boy on Board his Majesty's Ship Expedition Captain Summers but was Discharged from her at the Breaking up of the late War, and has been Employed in the Merchant's Service in the Virginia Trade That he was in Virginia when Proposals were made and published to Give Encouragement for Settling some Lands on the Ohio, And that he was amongst many others that embraced the said Proposals And he Believes there might be 100 in all But it being found necessary that some Forces should be raised, They were thrown into the Virginia Regiment as few or none would Inlist, and were called Volunteers. There were also Twenty two Gentlemen's Sons or thereabouts that made part of the said Regiment as Cadets, but he Believes they were to Receive no pay, But all the Volunteers who were to Settle the Lands were to have eight pence . . . [per] Day Virginia Currency, but that he never received one farthing tho' he was above five Months in the Service. That Col^o Washington marched with the first Detachment of that Regiment over the Allegani Mountains, some days before the Detachment that he Belonged to Consisted but of Eighty Men, and when they were all Joined the whole Virginia Regiment Including Cadets and Volunteers did not amount to Two hundred Men. Four or five days the Virginia

¹ Affidavit of John Shaw, submitted to the South Carolina Council, September 6, 1754, in Journal of South Carolina Council, September 3, 1754-January 1, 1755 (Colonial Office 5/471, Public Record Office, London).

Regiment had been alltogether at a place called the Great Meadows. They were Joined by Captⁿ Mackay with the Independent Company from South Carolina making in the whole with the aforesaid Regiment a Body of near three hundred Men. That they were for severall days together without any other Provisions than a Quart of Indian Corn delivered to each man, and for three days with only one pound of Beef each without any Corn. That he has heard that the Half King had Sixty Indians with him who were in our Interest But that he never saw above fforty. That he has been Informed by All the Men who belonged to the first Detachm^t That a few days before the Second joined them, they had an Engagement with a party of French. And the Account given to him was as follows. That an Indian and a White man having brought Col Washington Information that a party of French consisting of ffive and thirty men were out scouting and lay about Six Miles off upon which Col Washington with about Forty Men and Captⁿ Hogg with a party of fforty more and the Half King with his Indians consisting of thirteen, Immediately Sett out in Search of them, But having taken Different Roads Col^o Washington with his Men and the Indians came first up with them, and found them encamped between two Hills. Being Early in the Morning Some were asleep, and some eating. But having heard a Noise they were Immediately in Great Confusion and Betook themselves to their Arms, And as to this Deponent has heard One of them ffired a Gun upon which Col Washington Gave the Word for All his Men to Fire; Severall of them being killed; the Rest Betook themselves to fflight; But our Indians having gone round the ffrench, When they Saw them Immediately ffled Back to the English, and Delivered up their Arms desiring Quarter, Which was accordingly promised them. Sometime after, the Indians Came up, the Half King took his Tomahawk and Splitt the head of the ffrench Captain, having first Asked if he was an Englishman And having been told that he was a ffrench man, he then took out his Brains, and washed his hands with them, And then Scalped him All this he has heard and never heard it contradicted, But knows nothing of it from his own Knowledge, Only he has Seen the Bones of the ffrench Men who were killed in Number abt 13 or 14, And the Head of one Stuck upon a Stick; for none of them were Buryed, And he has also heard that one of our Men was killed at that time.

That Sometime after Captain Mackay had Joined the Virginia Regiment, Col Washington proposed to March to Attack the French Fort and accordingly Marched with the Virginia Regiment to Clear the Roads leaving Captⁿ Mackay behind at the Great Meadows. That they Cleared the Roads about twelve Miles, having been on that Service about three days, And then News having been brought by Two Indians That the French having been Reinforced with a large Body of Men, Were coming to Attack them with Nine Hundred Men. Orders were immediately Sent to Recall that party And also that Captⁿ Mackay should Advance with his Company, Which he accordingly did: And having Joined them

about two in the Morning. They Marched all back to the Great Meadows Burying in the Woods what part of their Amunition they could not Carry with them. They Continued at the Great Meadows three days before the French came to Attack them, And in the Morning before the Engagem^t they Endeavour'd to throw up a little Intrenchment round them about two feet deep, But could not finish it, as the French appeared betwixt Nine and ten in the Morning. We had Centinels placed out to Give Notice of of the Approach of the French; one of which fired his Peice, and immediately after the French Began to Fire, but being still at a considerable Distance, And did us no hurt, Our Men were drawn up before the French, but did not fire, The French still keeping at a Distance; They then turned off to a point of Wood that lay very near our Men, Upon which Our Men Went into their little Intrenchment, Upon which the French made a Second General Discharge, But our Men having kept up their fire, their Indians were thereby Encouraged to Advance out of the Wood, and Show themselves pretty near where our Men lay, upon which Col^o: Washington Gave the Word to fire which was accordingly done, and many of the Indians were killed. Our people having two Swivel Guns which were discharged at the same time. After this neither French nor Indians appeared any more but kept behind Trees firing at our Men the best part of the Day, As our People did at them. There was At this Place a Small Stocado Fort made in a Circular fform round a Small House that Stood in the Middle of it to keep our provisions and Amunition in, And was Cover'd with Bark and some Skins, and might be about fourteen ffeet Square, And the Walls of the Fort might be eight ffeet Distance from the said House all Round The French were at that time so near that Severall of our people were wounded by the Splinters beat off by the Bulletts from the said House. At Night the French Desired to Parley with our People, But Col^o: Washington refused. Imagining it might be some Deceit, however upon the Assurances given by the French, That they would Act honorably Captⁿ Vanbram and Adjutant Pyronie were sent to them And were told by them that they were to be Reinforced in the Morning by four hundred Indians who lay about twelve Miles off; And then it would not be in their power to give them Quarters. Advised them therefore to Capitulate, That they would be permitted to Return Home with their Arms, And to Carry with them what Provisions And Amunition they could Carry. But that they should Engage that none of them should be seen on the Waters of the Ohio for a Year and a day afterwards, And that if they Agreed to those Terms They should Hoist no Colours the next Morning. This was accordingly Agree'd to and Signed by Col^o: Washington & Agree'd to by all the Officers, And accordingly next Morning We Hoisted no Colours. And as soon as it was day the French & their Indians came in a Body beating their Drums And formed themselves into two Ranks, That our people might pass through, Which they accordingly did with their Drums beating, with their Arms and what provisions and Amunition they could Carry. But we were Obligated to

leave behind our Swivel Guns and some Arms which soon after were destroyed and broke to peices by their Indians. Such of our Men That were in that little Fort having Broke the Heads of the Powder Barrels And Strewn it about that it might be of no Service to the French.

We were also obliged to leave with them Captⁿ. Vanbram and Captⁿ Stobo as Hostages for the Delivery of the Twenty one prisoners that had been taken by Col^o: Washington as this Depon^t.. has related above who were then at Williamsburg That the French had been joined that Morning by above One hundred French Indians who could hardly be Restrained by them from falling on our People.

This Deponent has heard that some Dutch Men who were along with the French told some Dutch Men who were with us That they had lost three hundred Men, But does not know That of his own Knowledge, But Believes they lost a great many, As our People kept constantly firing at them the whole day. Of our Side there were Ten of the Carolina Company killed Of whom Lieutenant Mercier was one, And Twenty belonging to the Virginia Regiment. There were also a great many wounded whom our People carried with them the first Day's March, But then were Obligated to Leave them & a party with them to take Care of them till Horses could be sent for them, but he has heard that seven of them Died the first Night.

This Deponent then Marched on with the Rest of our Men to Will's-Creek but were Obligated to leave all their Stores and Baggage behind them. At Wills-Creek Sixteen of the Volunteers of the Virginia Regiment went in a Body to Col^o: Washington telling him, that as they Came to Settle the Lands Which now they had no more thought of doing, They were determined to Return home. Col^o: Washington endeavoured to persuade them to Stay, promising to procure them some Gratuity from the Government of Virginia for all their trouble and Losses, But he could not prevail with them, For they went off in a Body Soon after which he and Captⁿ. Mackay set out for Williamsburgh And after he was gone the Men went off daily in Two's and Three's, so that he verily Believes there was full two thirds of them gone When he this Deponent came off.

Some of the Indians who were in our Interest some days before the Engagement under Pretence of making some Discovery went Towards the French Fort and Meeting a French party, Were told that if they would not fight against the English, they would scalp them Upon which they all turned to the French. Tho the Half King however with their Women and Children in Number about Thirty Came with our people to Will's Creek. From which many of them Sett off For a place called Jemmy Arthor in Pensilvania where they Intended to live for fear of being killed by the other Indians. All the Indians on the Ohio and in those parts being in the French Interest And this Deponent Declares that there was not one Indian wth our people in the Engagement. The two that brought

the News of the approach of the french having immediately Sett off after delivering the above Intelligence.

27Aug^t. 1754

(Signed) John B W Shaw's Mark.

II COMPARISON WITH OTHER ACCOUNTS AND DOCUMENTS

By his own story, John Shaw was Irish, twenty years and upwards, and a seaman. The truth or falsity of these statements must have been fairly obvious to Governor James Glen before whom he made his affidavit. Apparently the Governor did not question them. John Shaw claimed that he was a boy on His Majesty's ship *Expedition*, and was discharged after the late war, or in 1748. Afterwards he was employed in the merchant service of Virginia and was in that colony when proposals were made and published to encourage land settlement on the Ohio. Only the last statement can be corroborated by the record of a John Shaw in Augusta County as early as July 29, 1750, when he took out a deed for 200 acres. Subsequent records show him to have been in the county until April 6, 1754.² Augusta County was far from the sea, and John Shaw, the landowner, could hardly have been engaged in the merchant service after 1750, though he could have served before that time.

His assertion that proposals were made to encourage land settlement was borne out by two measures, one passed in February, 1752, the other in November, 1753. They exempted settlers on the waters of the Mississippi from quitrents for ten and fifteen years, respectively.³ Also on February 19, 1754, Governor Robert Dinwiddie by proclamation granted 200,000 acres of land to be divided among those who voluntarily enlisted in the colony's service.⁴ John Shaw, the landowner, must have been interested in land, and John Shaw, the seaman, was also. He

² Lyman Chalkley (comp.), *Chronicles of the Scotch-Irish Settlement in Virginia*, 3 vols. (Rosslyn, Va., 1912), II, 383; I, 44, 62, 315, 438, 442, 443; III, 31, 32.

³ Henry R. McIlwaine and John P. Kennedy (eds.), *Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia*, 1619-1776, 13 vols. (Richmond, 1905-1915), 1752-1755, 1756-1758, pp. 57, 116; William W. Hening (ed.), *The Statutes at Large, Being a Collection of All the Laws of Virginia*, 13 vols. (Richmond, 1819-1823), VI, 258, 355-56.

⁴ Annapolis *Maryland Gazette*, March 7, 1754.

said that he and some one hundred others embraced the proposals, were "thrown" into the Virginia Regiment as few or none would enlist, and were called "Volunteers." On March 23, 1754, John Shaw, the landowner, with seven others, took the oath in Augusta County and was enrolled for His Majesty's service.⁵ If this were John Shaw, the seaman, he was not "thrown" into service but acted voluntarily. His statement regarding the general reluctance to enlist was substantiated by Washington, who complained of his difficulty in securing men.⁶ Governor Dinwiddie's orders, too, provided for the drafting of men,⁷ and custom did not frown on the use of force.

The Regiment, Shaw said, contained twenty-two gentlemen's sons called cadets, whom he believed served without compensation. Reference can be found to but two who appeared on the roster of July 3.⁸

Shaw was correct in saying that the men were paid 8 pence per day.⁹ But his insistence that he never received a "farthing" though he had been more than five months in service is questionable. If he were John Shaw, the landowner, he did not enlist until March 23.¹⁰ By his own statement, the seaman left the service about the middle of July. If identical with the landowner, he could not have served quite four months instead of "above five."

Moreover, he probably received some compensation. This analysis will show that his own statements put him in Major George Muse's division, and that division was paid to May 1.¹¹ If he did not enlist until

⁵ Chalkley (comp.), *Chronicles*, I, 62.

⁶ George Washington to Robert Dinwiddie, March 9, 1754, in John C. Fitzpatrick (ed.), *The Writings of George Washington*, 26 vols. (Washington, 1931-1938), I, 31-32; *id.* to *id.*, March 20, 1754, *ibid.*, 35.

⁷ Dinwiddie to Lord William Fairfax, [January, 1754], in Robert A. Brock (ed.), *The Official Records of Robert Dinwiddie, Lieutenant-Governor of the Colony of Virginia, 1751-1758*, 2 vols. (Richmond, 1883-1884), I, 49; *id.* to Colonel James Patton, January, 1754, *ibid.*, 50.

⁸ Washington Papers, 1592-1755, 304 vols. (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress), I.

⁹ Dinwiddie to Governor Horatio Sharpe, March 28, 1754, in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 116; *id.* to Governor James De Lancey, March 21, 1754, *ibid.*, 116-17; "Present Establishment of the Virginia Regiment with the Pay of each Officer," in Washington Papers, I.

¹⁰ Chalkley (comp.), *Chronicles*, I, 62.

¹¹ Major John Carlyle to Washington, June 17, 28, 1754, in Washington Papers, I.

March 23, he should have received over a month's payment. If he enlisted before that date as he claimed, he received more. Whether he was paid beyond May 1 is doubtful. The commissary's letter, dated Alexandria, June 28, was sent with money for the troops but could not have reached Washington until after the battle of Fort Necessity, July 3. Possibly it did not arrive until the forces had retreated to Wills Creek, or after Shaw had deserted. The letter, difficult to decipher, indicated Washington's division was to be paid first and that Muse's men, having been paid to May 1, must wait. The commissary admitted the troops had reason to complain because they had not been paid recently.¹²

Washington's detachment marched first, according to Shaw, followed by the division to which he belonged. Washington started April 2, he said, and he apparently arrived at Great Meadows May 24.¹³ Governor Dinwiddie wrote the Earl of Halifax, April 27, that officers had been commissioned and 300 men raised. One hundred and fifty (Washington's) began their march April 10, a discrepancy of eight days if Washington were correct in saying he left April 2. The other 150 under Colonel Joshua Fry, commander of all the forces, and Major Muse, marched the twentieth.¹⁴ Shaw said his detachment departed "some days" after Washington's. John Shaw, the landowner, was still in Augusta County on April 6 and so could not have marched with Washington. John Shaw, the seaman, expressly eliminated himself not only from Washington's division but also from Captain James Mackay's Independent Company; therefore he must have been with Muse. Muse's detachment joined Washington on June 9, eleven days after the battle at Great Meadows.¹⁵ Shaw said the "Second" joined a "few days" after the

¹² *Id. to id.*, June 28, 1754, *ibid.* See also, Washington to Dinwiddie, March 9, 1754, in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 31.

¹³ Washington's Journal, in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 38. See also, Washington to Colonel Joshua Fry, May 23, 1754, *ibid.*, 52; *id.* to Dinwiddie, May 27, 1754, *ibid.*, 53-54. These letters show his progress. The one to Dinwiddie was the first sent from Great Meadows. John C. Fitzpatrick (ed.), *The Diaries of George Washington, 1748-1799*, 4 vols. (Boston, 1925), I, 85.

¹⁴ Dinwiddie to Fairfax, March 15, [1754], in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 108; a list of officers, *ibid.*, 112-15; Dinwiddie to the Earl of Halifax, April 27, [1754], *ibid.*, 135; *id.* to the Earl of Holderness, April 27, 1754, *ibid.*, 133-34.

¹⁵ Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Diaries of George Washington*, I, 87-92.

battle, and stated elsewhere that Mackay's Independent Company came up later. Washington, too, placed their arrival after Muse.¹⁶ Andrew Montour, the half-breed, and eighteen scouts, some or all of them white, were supposed to have appeared about the same time as Muse.¹⁷ But if John Shaw were the landowner, his enlistment record precluded his being one of them. The seaman's account also ruled out the possibility. Moreover, John Shaw, the landowner, was sworn into service on the motion of Andrew Lewis. The same Lewis was also captain of the company in which were six of the seven men sworn along with Shaw. Although the names of John Shaw and William Pere were not on the return of this company, dated July 9, if they served, it must have been under Lewis, who was probably in the second division, commanded by Major Muse.¹⁸

Muse's division ought to have marched more rapidly than Washington's, which had to build roads and explore military possibilities and made only two to four miles a day.¹⁹ But delayed by Fry's illness and the necessity of conveying the major part of the baggage, the second detachment moved so slowly that on June 2 Dinwiddie ordered Muse to join Washington without further delay, leaving the wagons, etc., for the corps following (Mackay's) to care for.²⁰ Before Muse arrived, June

¹⁶ Washington to Dinwiddie, [June 12, 1754], in *id.* (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 80.

¹⁷ Charles A. Hanna, *The Wilderness Trail*, 2 vols. (New York, 1911), I, 230; Dinwiddie to Sharpe, December 17, 1754; January 7, 1755, in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 426, 450; "A list of Deserters and Prisoners at the French Fort," in Samuel Hazard (ed.), *Minutes of the Provincial Council of Pennsylvania*, 16 vols. (Harrisburg, 1852-1853), VI, 142-43. Cited hereafter as *Colonial Records of Pennsylvania*.

¹⁸ That Andrew Lewis was in George Muse's division was determined by a process of elimination. Washington marched with two companies of foot commanded by Captain Peter Hogg and Lieutenant Jacob Van Braam, and was later joined by Captain Adam Stephen. This comprised the first division. A morning return of his regiment, May 24, 1754, showed that he had three captains, who must have been Hogg, Stephen, and Van Braam who had been promoted. Therefore, Captain Lewis must have been with Muse. Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Diaries of George Washington*, I, 73-74, 80; Washington to Dinwiddie, March 20, 1754, in *id.* (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 36; Chalkley (comp.) *Chronicles*, I, 62; a roll of officers and soldiers before the "Battle of the Meadows in 1754," in Washington Papers, I; a list of officers, in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 113.

¹⁹ Washington to Dinwiddie, May 9, 1754, in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 45-46.

²⁰ Dinwiddie to Halifax, April 27, [1754], in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 135;

9, Colonel Fry had died, Dinwiddie had appointed Colonel James Innes to command, and Muse had been made a lieutenant colonel.²¹

Shaw gave 80 as the number in his detachment. Washington said Muse had upwards of 100; Dinwiddie, that Muse had 150.²² A morning return of the first detachment, May 24, before Muse joined, showed 183 officers and men. After his arrival, the entire Regiment on July 1 amounted to 293.²³ This would give Muse about 110 men and officers. Shaw claimed the whole Virginia Regiment was under 200 men. Washington wrote William Fairfax, August 11, 1754, "We were then from the first of February till the first of May, and could not compleat our 300 men by 40."²⁴ Shaw said there were only 300 after Captain Mackay and the Independent Company joined. According to Dinwiddie, Mackay had 100 men.²⁵ Colonel Innes, who never reached the front, gave the whole force as 400, a good many sick and "out of Order."²⁶ The Council of War, June 28, said the troops numbered 400.²⁷ But Captain Adam Stephen, an officer in the Virginia Regiment, and Dinwiddie, who had his information from Washington and Mackay, virtually agreed with Shaw's 300. This would contradict Washington's other statement that the Virginia Regiment alone amounted to 260.²⁸

Washington to Fry, May 29, 1754, *ibid.*, 183; Dinwiddie to *id.*, May 29, [1754], *ibid.*, 184-85; *id.* to Muse, June 2, 1754, *ibid.*, 187; *id.* to Captain James Mackay, June 2, [1754], *ibid.*, 188; *id.* to Washington, June 2, [1754], *ibid.*, 189.

²¹ Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Diaries of George Washington*, I, 91, 92; Dinwiddie to Washington, June 4, 1754, in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 193-94.

²² Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Diaries of George Washington*, I, 81; Dinwiddie to Halifax, April 27, [1754], in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 135.

²³ Washington Papers, I.

²⁴ Washington to Fairfax, August 11, 1754, in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 93.

²⁵ Dinwiddie to Carlyle, May 4, [1754], in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 150.

²⁶ Colonel James Innes to Governor James Hamilton, in *Philadelphia Pennsylvania Gazette*, July 25, 1754.

²⁷ Washington Papers, I.

²⁸ *Philadelphia Pennsylvania Gazette*, August 1 (reprint of account of Washington and Mackay, in Williamsburg *Virginia Gazette*, July 19, 1754), 22, 1754; Dinwiddie to the Lords of Trade, [July 24, 1754], in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 239; Jean Victor Varin to François Bigot, July 24, 1754, in John B. Linn and William H. Egle (eds.), *Pennsylvania Archives*, Ser. II, 19 vols. (Harrisburg, 1874-1890), VI, 168, gives the English forces at Fort Necessity as 500, evidently an exaggeration. See also, Washington to Fairfax, August 11, 1754, in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 93.

Thus, even those who took part disagreed over the number. Desertions, additions, names on the pay roll of men who never reached the front, and contradictory statements make exactness impossible. Some of the estimates appear to be based on men alone; others, on men and officers. Shaw seems to have been as accurate as other participants, whose natural inclination was to minimize the number and so explain their defeat.

The shortage of provisions noted by Shaw was also pointed out by Washington in a letter to Dinwiddie, June 12. "We have been six days without flour," he wrote, "and there is none upon the road for our relief that we know of. . . . We have not provisions of any sort enough in camp to serve us two days," a scarcity confirmed by the commissary.²⁹ The Council of War at Gist House, June 28, said the troops had been without meal or bread for six days, and it was uncertain when any would arrive. The men were in a starving condition.³⁰

Shaw said that he never saw more than forty Indians though he heard the Half King had sixty with him. As Shaw arrived some days after the battle of Great Meadows, he must have seen the forty after that event. On May 9, before the battle, Washington wrote Dinwiddie that the Half King was on his way to join with fifty men (close to the number given by Shaw). After the battle, Washington wrote, June 3, that the Half King and twenty-five families containing about eighty persons were in camp.³¹ This was double the number seen by Shaw. But the eighty included women and children, and by implication Shaw's forty did not, for he was talking of the number "in our Interest."

Shaw's knowledge of the battle was based, he said, on information received from the men of the first detachment who had had an engagement with the French a few days before the second joined. The battle

²⁹ Washington to Dinwiddie, [June 12, 1754], in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 76-84; *id.* to Fairfax, August 11, 1754, *ibid.*, 95; Albert T. Volwiler, *George Croghan and the Westward Movement, 1741-1782* (Cleveland, 1926), 86; Dinwiddie to Washington, June 27, 1754, in Washington Papers, I; *id.* to Carlyle, June 25, 27, [1754], in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 219-21.

³⁰ Washington Papers, I.

³¹ Washington to Dinwiddie, May 9, June 3, 1754, in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 46, 71.

was fought on May 28; the second division joined June 9; so eleven or a "few days" intervened.³² An Indian and a white man brought warning of the French, Shaw said, intimating that they came together. Washington wrote that a white man, Christopher Gist, brought the news in the morning, and an Indian brought it at night.³³ Captain Stephen said information was received about sunset.³⁴

The number of men in the French detachment according to Shaw was thirty-five, encamped about six miles distant. Washington, writing before he encountered the French, said Gist estimated their force at fifty and their tracks five miles from camp. But after the engagement Washington in several letters placed their numbers between thirty-two and thirty-four,³⁵ approximately Shaw's statement. The other accounts were also in comparative agreement.³⁶

Upon receipt of the news, according to Shaw, Washington dispatched Captain [Peter]³⁷ Hogg with forty men and set out himself with forty, accompanied by the Half King and thirteen Indians. Again Shaw combined the departure of the men as he did the arrival of the messengers. Washington said seventy-three men and officers under "Captain Hog" were dispatched in the morning upon receipt of Gist's information. This was almost double Shaw's estimate. Washington, himself, set out at night with forty, seven of whom were lost en route. He arrived at the

³² *Id.* (ed.), *Diaries of George Washington*, I, 87, 92.

³³ Washington to Dinwiddie, May 27, 1754, in *id.* (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 53-54; Washington's Journal, May 27, 1754, *ibid.*, 55.

³⁴ Philadelphia *Pennsylvania Gazette*, September 19, 1754.

³⁵ Washington to Dinwiddie, May 27, 29, June 3, 1754, in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 54, 64-65, 73; *id.* to John A. Washington, May 31, 1754, *ibid.*, 70.

³⁶ Annapolis *Maryland Gazette*, June 13, 1754, quoted in Philadelphia *Pennsylvania Gazette*, June 27, 1754, and based on the vague authority, "a certain Account from the Westward." It stated inaccurately that La Force was in command. See also, *ibid.*, September 19, 1754; Orders of Claude Pierre Pécaudy, Sieur de Contrecoeur, French commander at Fort Duquesne, to Joseph Coulon, Sieur de Jumonville, in *Olden Time*, 2 vols. (Pittsburgh, 1846-1847), II, 188-89; Statement of Scarrooyady (Monocatoocha), an Oneida chief, before the Pennsylvania Council, December 19, 1754, in Hazard (ed.), *Colonial Records of Pennsylvania*, VI, 195.

³⁷ As Shaw did not give full names in his deposition, it seems best where there is indirect quotation from it, and in one other case, to place the given names in brackets.

Indian camp near sunrise and persuaded the Half King and a few of his Indians to accompany him.³⁸

Once more Shaw made a combination, implying that the Half King and his Indians started off at the outset with Washington. The thirteen Indians given by Shaw corresponded with Washington's ten or twelve. Elsewhere Washington said, "7 Indians with arms, two of which were Boys"; Indian trader John Davison mentioned eight, who did most of the execution; and Captain Stephen five, two of them boys.³⁹

Shaw said Hogg's men and Washington's took different roads, and the Washington party and Indians came up first with the French. Again Shaw was supposing that the parties left together. Washington did not state what happened to Hogg and his men, but Washington's description of the engagement indicated they did not participate.⁴⁰ Captain Stephen spoke of a "Superior Party," evidently Hogg's, and said they missed the French. He too referred to the force of forty, himself among them, dispatched in the evening by Washington. Like him, Stephen claimed that seven were lost and only thirty-three took part.⁴¹ Stephen also recounted the delay caused by the heavy rain through which they marched, a handicap described by Washington, by the report in the *Philadelphia Pennsylvania Gazette* of June 27, and by both French accounts,⁴² but not by Shaw.

³⁸ Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Diaries of George Washington*, I, 86; Washington to Dinwiddie, May 27, 29, June 3, 1754, in *id.* (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 54, 63-64, 73.

³⁹ *Id.* to John A. Washington, May 31, 1754, in *id.* (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 70; *id.* to Dinwiddie, June 3, 1754, *ibid.*, 73; Statement of John Davison before the Pennsylvania Council, December 19, 1754, in Hazard (ed.), *Colonial Records of Pennsylvania*, VI, 195; *Philadelphia Pennsylvania Gazette*, September 19, 1754.

⁴⁰ Washington's Journal, in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 56; Washington to Dinwiddie, May 29, 1754, *ibid.*, 64; *id.* to John A. Washington, May 31, 1754, *ibid.*, 70.

⁴¹ *Philadelphia Pennsylvania Gazette*, September 19, 1754; Washington to Dinwiddie, June 3, 1754, in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 73.

⁴² *Philadelphia Pennsylvania Gazette*, June 27, September 19, 1754; Washington's Journal, in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 55; Washington to Dinwiddie, May 29, 1754, *ibid.*, 64; Contrecoeur to Michel Ange, Marquis de Duquesne de Menneville, June 2, 1754, based on the account of Monceau, who escaped at the outset of the encounter, and on information from the Indians, in *Olden Time*, II, 189-91; Dr[o]uillon to Dinwiddie, n. d., in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 225-26. Drouillon was a French officer captured in the engagement.

He pictured the French "encamped between two Hills," some eating, some sleeping, when Washington arrived in early morning and surprised them. Captain Stephen also set early morning as the time of arrival.⁴³ Washington located the French "ab't half a mile from the Road in a very obscure place surrounded with Rocks." Indian trader Davison said they were encamped in a hollow. Washington said the Half King called it "a low obscure place," and Hulbert in his *Historic Highways* portrayed them "in a valley four hundred feet deep."⁴⁴

The French heard a noise, Shaw continued, and in "Great Confusion" took to their arms. One of them fired, and Washington then gave the command to fire. The account in the *Pennsylvania Gazette* of June 27 likewise maintained that the French fired first. Washington wrote, "I was the first Man that approached them, and the first whom they saw, and immediately upon it ran to their Arms, and fir'd briskly till they were defeated."⁴⁵ At another time, he said that he attacked from all sides, ordering his company to fire after the French discovered them.⁴⁶ Stephen did not say who fired first.⁴⁷ The French declared that they were surrounded by English and Indians and the English opened fire.⁴⁸

Shaw asserted several of the French were killed, the rest fled, but confronted by the Indians who had cut off their escape, they went back to the English and asked for quarter, which was promised them. The account in the *Pennsylvania Gazette* of June 27 resembled Shaw's up to the meeting with the Indians. At this point the *Gazette* described the killing and scalping of five Frenchmen. One of them, [Joseph Coulon, Sieur de] Jumonville, was dispatched by the Half King with his toma-

⁴³ Philadelphia *Pennsylvania Gazette*, September 19, 1754.

⁴⁴ Washington to Dinwiddie, May 29, 1754, in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 64; *id.* (ed.), *Diaries of George Washington*, I, 87; Statement of Davison before the Pennsylvania Council, December 19, 1754, in Hazard (ed.), *Colonial Records of Pennsylvania*, VI, 195; Archer B. Hulbert, *Historic Highways of America*, 16 vols. (Cleveland, 1902-1905), III, 144.

⁴⁵ Washington to Dinwiddie, [May 29, 1754], in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 69.

⁴⁶ *Id.* to *id.*, May 29, 1754, *ibid.*, 64; *id.* (ed.), *Diaries of George Washington*, I, 87.

⁴⁷ Philadelphia *Pennsylvania Gazette*, September 19, 1754.

⁴⁸ Contrecoeur to Marquis du Quesne, June 2, 1754, in *Olden Time*, II, 189-90; Dr[o]uillon to Dinwiddie, n. d., in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 225-26.

hawk. The French then fled back to the English and surrendered; Washington with difficulty kept the Indians from scalping all. According to Shaw, the Indians came up after the French had surrendered and asked if the French captain were English. Being told he was French, the Half King tomahawked him, took his brains out, washed his own hands with them, and scalped him. The order of events seems twisted, and the story hardly bears the earmarks of truth: the Indians' approach after the surrender, the query, the lack of any effort to restrain them. Shaw did not mention any further scalping on the part of the Indians. Indian trader Davison, who claimed to have been in the action, maintained, "The Indians came out of their Cover and closed with the French and killed them with their Tomhawks."⁴⁹ Stephen said three Indians and two boys arrived before the engagement was over. He did not connect them with the death of Jumonville, merely stating that Jumonville and eleven privates were killed immediately.⁵⁰ Washington also did not describe the manner of Jumonville's death, though he later denied the French claim that he had been assassinated.⁵¹ Washington acknowledged, however, that the Indians scalped the dead, and elaborated at another time, "there were 5 or 6 Indians, who served to knock the poor unhappy wounded in the head, and bereiv'd them of their scalps."⁵² This may explain why only one Frenchman was wounded.⁵³ Shaw mentioned none.

The savages apparently behaved according to custom and killed and scalped some of the French, possibly Jumonville. If so, he doubtless

⁴⁹ Statement of Davison before the Pennsylvania Council, December 19, 1754, in Hazard (ed.), *Colonial Records of Pennsylvania*, VI, 195. Davison's account differs from the others in maintaining that Washington and the Half King could not agree. Although both groups attacked the French, they acted independently of each other.

⁵⁰ Philadelphia *Pennsylvania Gazette*, September 19, 1754.

⁵¹ "Capitulation of Fort Necessity, 1754," in Samuel Hazard (ed.), *Pennsylvania Archives*, Ser. I, 12 vols. (Philadelphia, 1852-1856), II, 146-47. Cited hereafter as Articles of Capitulation. Jared Sparks (ed.), *The Writings of George Washington*, 12 vols. (Boston, 1834-1837), II, 464; Washington to Dinwiddie, May 29, 1754, in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 64; *id.* (ed.), *Diaries of George Washington*, I, 87.

⁵² Washington's Journal, in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 56; Washington to Dinwiddie, June 3, 1754, *ibid.*, 73.

⁵³ Washington's Journal, *ibid.*, 56; Washington to Dinwiddie, May 29, 1754, *ibid.*, 64.

died at the hands of the Half King. The French, however, maintained that Jumonville was killed by a musket shot while the summons asking the English to retire was being read. But they had this information from the Indians, who would scarcely blame themselves for the killing, and whose statements could not be relied upon.⁵⁴ Drouillon, the captured French officer, in a letter to Dinwiddie, did not describe the manner of Jumonville's death, though he complained bitterly of the treatment a French embassy had received from the English.⁵⁵ Had he seen Jumonville cruelly murdered, he would have made the most of the episode.

Closing his rehearsal of the Jumonville affair, Shaw again disclaimed firsthand knowledge. He attempted to strengthen his statements by claiming that he had never heard them contradicted. Also, with his own eyes he had seen the "Bones" of thirteen or fourteen Frenchmen and the head of one stuck on a stick, a spectacle mentioned in no other English account. But Louis Coulon de Villiers, brother of Jumonville, claimed that he passed the place, July 3, where his brother had been "assassinated" and "saw there yet some dead bodies."⁵⁶ Both men apparently viewed the unburied French either as "Bones" or "bodies." The former seems probable as it was a region in which the scavenger ranged.

The number of French dead, given by Shaw as thirteen or fourteen, was twice stated by Washington as ten, and once as twelve. Other English sources gave approximately the same number.⁵⁷ But the French minimized their losses. Eight, they said, basing their estimate on the

⁵⁴ Contrecoeur to Marquis du Quesne, June 2, 1754, in *Olden Time*, II, 189-90. In the Articles of Capitulation the French claimed Jumonville was assassinated because Washington had attacked a peaceful embassy. Articles of Capitulation, in Hazard (ed.), *Pennsylvania Archives*, Ser. I, Vol. II, 146-47.

⁵⁵ Dr[o]uillon to Dinwiddie, n. d., in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 225-26.

⁵⁶ Journal of Coulon de Villiers, in *Olden Time*, II, 212.

⁵⁷ Washington to Dinwiddie, May 29, 1754, in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 64; *id.* to John A. Washington, May 31, 1754, *ibid.*, 70; *id.* (ed.), *Diaries of George Washington*, I, 87; Philadelphia *Pennsylvania Gazette*, June 27, September 19, 1754; Statement of Scarrooyady before the Pennsylvania Council, in Hazard (ed.), *Colonial Records of Pennsylvania*, VI, 195.

account given them by the Indians.⁵⁸ Shaw, Washington, and Stephen agreed on one as the number of English killed. Washington gave the wounded as two or three, Stephen as three.⁵⁹ Shaw omitted this item, but reported twenty-one prisoners. This last number is well established as correct, though Stephen gave twenty-two.⁶⁰

Drouillon's account insisted that the French were on a peaceful embassy. They had not spied on the English and were not even sure they were in the vicinity. Washington surprised the French, would not heed their request for a conference, and attacked, later explaining that he could not withstand the solicitation of the Indians.⁶¹ The credibility of this statement must be weighed against Washington's that he had at most ten or twelve Indians.⁶² The French account resembled Shaw's only in the approximate position of the French, the surprise attack, and Jumonville's death. The second French version given by Monceau to Claude Pierre Pécaudy, Sieur de Contrecoeur, French commander at Fort Duquesne, commented on the surprise attack and implied that the English alone did the firing. Jumonville, through an interpreter, called on them to desist and began to read the summons asking the English to retire. While his men formed in platoons about him, one of them, Monceau, took the opportunity to flee. The Indians who took part in the affair, Contrecoeur continued, said Jumonville was killed by a bullet while the summons was being read and that they alone prevented the English from killing all the French by rushing in between them.⁶³ This seems strange behavior for Indians allied with the English, and illustrates the French desire to blame the English.

⁵⁸ Contrecoeur to Marquis du Quesne, June 2, 1754, in *Olden Time*, II, 189-90.

⁵⁹ Washington to Dinwiddie, May 29, 1754, in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 66; *id.* to John A. Washington, May 31, 1754, *ibid.*, 70; *Philadelphia Pennsylvania Gazette*, September 19, 1754.

⁶⁰ Washington to Dinwiddie, May 29, 1754, in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 64; *id.* to John A. Washington, May 31, 1754, *ibid.*, 70; Statement of Scarrooyady before the Pennsylvania Council, in Hazard (ed.), *Colonial Records of Pennsylvania*, VI, 195; *Philadelphia Pennsylvania Gazette*, September 19, 1754; Dinwiddie to Colonel James Innes, August 22, 1754, in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 293.

⁶¹ Dr[o]uillon to Dinwiddie, n. d., in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 225-26.

⁶² Washington to John A. Washington, May 31, 1754, in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 70; *id.* to Dinwiddie, June 3, 1754, *ibid.*, 73.

⁶³ Contrecoeur to Marquis du Quesne, June 2, 1754, in *Olden Time*, II, 189-90.

Contrecoeur's account disagreed radically with the statement of Drouillon that Washington claimed he could not halt the attack because of the solicitations of the Indians. Nor did Drouillon hint at any noble Indian defense of the French. The Indians may have told this tale to the French; that the latter believed it is incredible. Refuting the French accusations, Washington defended the English position and denied the ambassadorial character of the French party. His defense was so vehement that he has been accused of having an uneasy conscience.⁶⁴ Both sides were bent on portraying their activities in a favorable light and blaming the enemy as the aggressor. In this Shaw naturally followed the English.

The rest of his affidavit, he maintained, was based on his own experiences. Some time after Captain Mackay arrived with the Independent Company, Washington marched with the Virginia Regiment to clear the roads for an attack on the French. Mackay was left behind at Great Meadows. These statements were substantiated by Washington, who placed Mackay's arrival on or about June 12, and his own road making and advance as beginning June 15-16.⁶⁵

Shaw said that they built twelve miles of road in about three days. Washington described the road building as lasting from June 15 to June 28 with intermissions in which nothing was done because of the presence of hostile Indians.⁶⁶ The exact number of days spent in road making is therefore impossible to determine, but Shaw's three is evidently too few.

His estimate of the distance covered appears reasonably accurate. Washington's camp was at Gist House, approximately twelve miles from Great Meadows according to Stephen.⁶⁷ The Council of War, June 28, estimated the distance as thirteen miles of bad, hilly road,

⁶⁴ Washington to Dinwiddie, [May 29, 1754], in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 68-69; Rupert Hughes, *George Washington*, 3 vols. (New York, 1926-1930), I, 145-46, 148, n. 2, 149, n. 3.

⁶⁵ Washington to Dinwiddie, [June 12, 1754], in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 80, 83; *id.* (ed.), *Diaries of George Washington*, I, 93.

⁶⁶ *Id.* (ed.), *Diaries of George Washington*, I, 93-102.

⁶⁷ Philadelphia *Pennsylvania Gazette*, August 22, 1754; Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 169, n. 121.

which should prove such an obstacle to the French that the English would have time to obtain intelligence and secure their convoys. This among other reasons caused the retreat.⁶⁸ Obviously the road making was completed to Gist's and probably beyond.⁶⁹ Shaw said two Indians brought news that the French, reinforced by a large body of men, were coming to attack with a force of 900. Other English accounts did not say how the intelligence was received.⁷⁰ But the Council of War at Gist's was called upon warning from Monocatoocha (Scarrooyady), an Indian scout, who had left the French fort but two days before. He said that he had seen reinforcements arriving and had heard the French declare their intention of attacking.⁷¹ At the same council the number of French forces was given as 800 French, 400 Indians,⁷² considerably

⁶⁸ Washington Papers, I.

⁶⁹ Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Diaries of George Washington*, I, 102.

⁷⁰ The English accounts of the Battle of Fort Necessity are as follows: (1) Affidavit of Private John Shaw, a supposed eyewitness. See pp. 23-27. (2) Dinwiddie to the Lords of Trade, [July 24, 1754], in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 239-43. This was based on the accounts of Washington and Mackay. It will hereafter be referred to as the Dinwiddie Letter. Dinwiddie wrote several other letters summarizing the engagement and enclosing copies of the Williamsburg *Virginia Gazette* of July 19, 1754, for details. See Dinwiddie to James Abercromby, July 24, [1754], *ibid.*, 237; *id.* to Henry Fox, Secretary at War, July 24, [1754], *ibid.*, 245; *id.* to J. & C. Hanbury, July 24, [1754], *ibid.*, 253; *id.* to Governor Glen, August 5, [1754], *ibid.*, 275. Dinwiddie was the source of the account in the *Virginia Gazette*, which was likewise based on the information given him by Washington and Mackay. Unable to locate this newspaper, the authors used (3) the *Annapolis Maryland Gazette*, July 25, 1754, which quoted the account in the *Virginia Gazette*. Coming from Dinwiddie, this newspaper account was naturally very similar to the Dinwiddie Letter but contained enough differences to make necessary the use of both. It will hereafter be referred to as the Dinwiddie Newspaper Account. (4) Letter attributed to Captain Adam Stephen, eyewitness, to "a gentleman in this province," August 9, 1754, published in the Philadelphia *Pennsylvania Gazette*, August 22, 1754. This will hereafter be referred to as the Stephen Account. (5) Colonel James Innes to Governor James Hamilton, July 12, 1754, published in the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, July 25, 1754. It was based on information from Washington and Mackay, but was less detailed than other accounts. It will hereafter be referred to as the Innes Letter.

The French accounts of the battle are as follows: (1) Journal of Coulon de Villiers, eyewitness and commander of the French forces, published as part of the French Memorial, in *Olden Time*, II, 210-13. It will hereafter be referred to as the Villiers Journal. (2) Jean Victor Varin to François Bigot, July 24, 1754, in Linn and Egle (eds.), *Pennsylvania Archives*, Ser. II, Vol. VI, 168-69. It was based on the account of M. du Sablé who had come from the vicinity of the battle. It will hereafter be referred to as the Varin Letter.

⁷¹ Washington Papers, I.

⁷² *Ibid.*

more than Shaw's estimate. The Stephen Account described the French reinforcements as 300 whites and 300 Indians but did not give the number coming to attack. The Dinwiddie Letter and the Dinwiddie Newspaper Account gave the reinforcements as 700 and the attacking body as 900. The latter statement agreed with Shaw. The Innes Letter estimated 900 men plus "a considerable Body of *Indians*." The Varin Letter, a French source, minimized the French forces—700, of whom 100 were Indians.

The Stephen Account set June 29 as the date of warning, but Stephen must have been wrong. At the Council of War, June 28, warning had been received.⁷³ As usual, Shaw gave no date. His affidavit implied the arrival of the alarm several days before the battle of July 3. The Dinwiddie Letter and the Dinwiddie Newspaper Account placed the warning and battle on the same day, July 3, which was manifestly inaccurate. Not only did the Council of War indicate a warning at least five days before that date, but the battle began in the morning and the English required time for their retreat and the construction of the entrenchment.

From the time warning was received until the English forces reached Fort Necessity, only Shaw and Stephen described what occurred. The Stephen Account was much more complete, but the two accounts agreed on essentials. Shaw—orders were sent to recall the road-building party. Stephen—orders were sent to the two detachments that were out to rejoin with the "utmost expedition." They arrived the next forenoon. Stephen said that these orders were sent June 29, but the troops were all together, June 28, when the Council of War was held.⁷⁴ Shaw—Mackay was told to advance with his troops, arriving at 2:00 A.M. Stephen—Mackay's forces joined at night. Shaw—they all marched back to Great Meadows, burying in the woods the ammunition they could not carry. Stephen—they retreated leaving part of their baggage behind.

In stipulating three days, Shaw probably overstated the time the English spent at Fort Necessity before the attack. He might have fig-

⁷³ *Ibid.*

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

ured three days because they arrived one day (July 1 according to Stephen), were there another, and on the third day, or July 3, the French attacked. Stephen's Account and all the other accounts but Shaw's, which gave no day, agreed on the date of attack.

On the morning of battle, Shaw said, they endeavored to throw up a little entrenchment, but could not complete it because of the arrival of the French. As the English were at Fort Necessity either two days (Stephen) or three (Shaw), before the attack, they would hardly have left the strengthening of the fort until the day the French appeared. But the English accounts agreed⁷⁵ that the entrenchment was incomplete when the enemy arrived. Stephen placed the blame on the disinclination of the men to work. They reached their destination much fatigued, he said. Shaw described the "little Intrrenchment round them about two feet deep." The Dinwiddie Letter and the Dinwiddie Newspaper Account said that it was small. Stephen pictured it as a log breastwork.

The time of the French appearance given by Shaw as nine to ten in the morning was set at about eleven by other English accounts. The battle was described by all as lasting from morning until night. The Varin Letter said that it endured ten hours. Shaw, the Dinwiddie Letter, and the Dinwiddie Newspaper Account mentioned the sentry's warning shot⁷⁶ followed by fire from the French, which had no effect because of the distance separating the forces.

Shaw said that the English were drawn up "before the ffrench." Before their entrenchments, said the Dinwiddie Letter and the Dinwiddie Newspaper Account. All English versions except Innes's maintained that the English reserved their fire. Shaw described the French turning off to a point of woods close to the English. The Dinwiddie Newspaper Account said they advanced to a point of woods sixty yards off and the Dinwiddie Letter gave the same distance without mentioning the woods. Shaw described the second discharge of the French as occurring *after* the English retired to their trenches. The Dinwiddie Letter and the

⁷⁵ Innes made no statement.

⁷⁶ Stephen's account of the sentry is unlike the others. He said warning was given at daybreak by a sentry, wounded by the French.

Dinwiddie Newspaper Account placed it *before* and attributed the retirement to the refusal of the French to fight in the open. Shaw offered no explanation for the retirement.

The Villiers Journal differed from the English accounts in most particulars. The English were blamed for firing first,⁷⁷ advancing on the French, and then were described as retiring to their entrenchment. No mention was made of French firing until the English were safely entrenched, when the French began their real investment of the fort. The fire was "brisk on both sides" until they actually smothered the English cannon with musketry shot, an achievement not admitted by the English.

Shaw alone pictured the French Indians advancing from the woods to meet death under English fire. But the other accounts and the Articles of Capitulation mentioned the presence of French Indians.⁷⁸

Shaw's, too, was the only English version to describe the firing of swivel guns. He was borne out by the French commander's boast of silencing English cannon with musketry fire.⁷⁹ Shaw spoke of but two pieces; the Stephen Account, of nine in English possession without mentioning their use in battle. The Villiers Journal and the Varin Letter likewise gave nine. The Articles of Capitulation mentioned cannon but no special number. Shaw was describing the opening of the encounter and may not have intended the obvious inference that two swivels were the only ones in English possession. Possibly they had not time to mount all their cannon;⁸⁰ the entrenchments were left incomplete because of lack of time. Also the guns may have been so mounted that but two bore on the French advance.

After the preliminary clash Shaw described the enemy as keeping behind trees with firing on both sides "the best part of the Day." Active

⁷⁷ Varin Letter—they were drawn up in order of battle but "wheeled back under their entrenchment" before the French fired.

⁷⁸ Dinwiddie Newspaper Account excepted; Stephen Account by implication; Articles of Capitulation, in Hazard (ed.), *Pennsylvania Archives*, Ser. I, Vol. II, 146-47.

⁷⁹ Villiers Journal.

⁸⁰ Washington to Dinwiddie, [June 12, 1754], in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 78, mentioned erecting small swivels in an hour. Possibly these were the ones used in the engagement.

firing was implied by the Dinwiddie Letter and the Villiers Journal. The Dinwiddie Letter and the Dinwiddie Newspaper Account said that the French were sheltered by trees; the Villiers Journal—the fort “was advantageously enough situated in a meadow, within a musket shot from the woods,” which bears out Shaw’s statement that the men were wounded by splinters beaten off the house by bullets fired at close range. He gave the only description of this and also of the house and “Stocado Fort,” circular in shape, a fact substantiated by Colonel William Byrd’s observations after his visit in 1759.⁸¹ Shaw emphasized the smallness of the enclosure—a small house about fourteen feet square covered with bark and skins.⁸² “The Walls of the Fort might be eight ffeet Distance from the said House all Round.” Outside this stockade was the “little Intrenchment.” The Half King contemptuously referred to the fort as “that little thing upon the Meadow.” Washington described it as “a small palisado’d Fort.”⁸³

The first request of the French for parley was denied because the English feared deceit, according to Shaw, Stephen, and Dinwiddie.⁸⁴ The Villiers Journal and the Varin Letter mentioned no refusal. A second request was accompanied by assurances that the French would act honorably, Shaw said. The Dinwiddie Letter and the Dinwiddie Newspaper Account maintained the French gave their parole for the safe return of the English officers. Whereupon Colonel Washington dispatched Captain [Jacob] Van Braam and [William La] Peyronie, as recounted by Shaw and the Dinwiddie Newspaper Account. The Dinwiddie Letter said two officers were sent. The Stephen Account spoke of only Van Braam, describing Peyronie as dangerously wounded,

⁸¹ Hulbert, *Historic Highways of America*, III, 182.

⁸² On June 12 Washington ordered baggage and ammunition placed in the fort, indicating an enclosure. Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Diaries of George Washington*, I, 92. But Stephen recounted the difficulty of reading the terms of surrender in the rain. With ammunition stored in the house, however, they would scarcely have ventured to use a lighted candle inside.

⁸³ Conrad Weiser’s Journal, in Hazard (ed.), *Colonial Records of Pennsylvania*, VI, 151-52; Washington to Dinwiddie, June 3, 1754, in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 193.

⁸⁴ Stephen Account; Dinwiddie Letter; Dinwiddie Newspaper Account.

which Washington corroborated in a letter to Dinwiddie, August 20.⁸⁵ The Villiers Journal, too, mentioned only one messenger, a captain.

Shaw said that the French urged capitulation because 400 Indians were expected to join them the following morning and it would then be impossible to give the English quarter.⁸⁶ Although this cannot be substantiated, Villiers warned the English of Indian cruelties, from which he could offer them no escape if they did not surrender. If they capitulated he would try to protect them.⁸⁷ This promise of protection was incorporated into the Articles of Capitulation.⁸⁸ Shaw, the Dinwiddie Letter, and the Dinwiddie Newspaper Account told of 100 Indians who joined the French the next morning and could hardly be restrained from attacking the English. The Villiers Journal also mentioned the effort required to hold back the Indians.

The Articles of Capitulation⁸⁹ were outlined with fair accuracy by Shaw either as terms of surrender or in the events following. Shaw—the English were permitted to return home with their arms. Articles—the English commander was granted the right to retire with all his garrison “peaceably into his own country.” The Dinwiddie Newspaper Account stated inaccurately that each side agreed to “retire without Molestation,” the French to Fort Monongahela, the English to Wills Creek.

Shaw—the English were allowed to carry with them what provisions and ammunition they could. They were obliged to leave their swivel guns. Articles—the English were permitted to take whatever belonged to them except the artillery, which the French reserved for themselves. Stephen's Account maintained that the French agreed to destroy the cannon instead of reserving them for their use. According to the Vil-

⁸⁵ Washington to Dinwiddie, August 20, 1754, in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 96.

⁸⁶ The report of the Council of War on June 28, 1754, mentioned 400 Indians with the French. Washington Papers, I.

⁸⁷ Villiers Journal.

⁸⁸ Articles of Capitulation, in Hazard (ed.), *Pennsylvania Archives*, Ser. I, Vol. II, 146-47.

⁸⁹ Articles of Capitulation as given by the English are followed by the text unless otherwise indicated. *Ibid.* See also version in the Villiers Journal, and the French translation, in Philadelphia *Pennsylvania Gazette*, August 22, 1754.

liers Journal, they did destroy them. The Dinwiddie Newspaper Account said that the English forces were permitted to take all stores, effects, and baggage.

Shaw—"they should Engage that none of them should be seen on the Waters of the Ohio for a Year and a day afterwards." Articles—they gave their word of honor to work on no establishment in the surrounding country or beyond the highlands for one year beginning this day. No period of time was given in the French version cited in the Villiers Journal, but the year period was stipulated in the copy of the capitulation in French printed in the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, August 22. Stephen's Account declared that the Articles on this point were badly translated and were accepted under a misunderstanding.

Shaw's statement is too broad— ". . . none of them" was to be "seen on the Waters of the Ohio." Actually they were only forbidden to work on an establishment, and because of incorrect grammar the "they" in the Articles could have referred merely to the English forces at Fort Necessity, seemingly Shaw's interpretation. "They" might have meant any Englishmen and was doubtless so intended by Villiers, who said in his journal, "We made them abandon the King's country." The English officers adopted a still narrower meaning, claiming that "they" meant only the guard left with the baggage and the sick.⁹⁰ At any rate, another English force, with which Washington served, was back in the territory before the year was out.⁹¹

Shaw—if the English agreed to the terms, they were to hoist no colors the following morning, which was accordingly done. Articles—as soon as the Articles were signed by both parties, the English were to take down their flag.

Shaw—the terms were agreed to and signed by Washington, and agreed to by all the officers. Articles—the terms were signed by Mackay, Washington, and Villiers.

⁹⁰ Dinwiddie to Hamilton, July 31, 1754, in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 256; Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 89-90, n. 61.

⁹¹ Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 120-47; Dinwiddie to Innes, August 1, [1754], in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 261-62. Shortly after the defeat Dinwiddie was planning how to drive out the French.

Shaw—at daybreak, the French and Indians came in a body beating their drums and formed in two ranks that the English might pass through. Articles—at daybreak a detachment of French was to receive the surrender of the garrison and take possession of the fort. The Dinwiddie Letter and Villiers Journal were very similar, though Shaw alone mentioned the formation into two ranks, not an unusual form of surrender.

Shaw—the English marched out between the French lines with drums beating, carrying arms, provisions, and ammunition according to the agreement. This description was much the same as that in the Dinwiddie Newspaper Account. The Dinwiddie Letter was less detailed. Articles—the English were granted honors of war and permitted to come forth, drums beating, and with one piece of cannon. This was evidently the sole exception to the French confiscation of the artillery. Shaw made no mention of such a piece, but said the cannon and arms which they had to leave were later destroyed by Indians. The Villiers Journal, too, said that the cannon were demolished, even the one left to the English, as they could not carry it away. The fort was likewise destroyed, Villiers maintained. Jean Victor Varin wrote that it was burned,⁹² but green timber is hard to burn, and he alone made the claim. He also said the cannon were destroyed. The Innes Letter mentioned the destruction of the "Works," about which Shaw said nothing. He did, however, assert that before evacuating the English broke open the powder barrels and strewed the powder about to make it useless. This would be a very natural action, though mentioned by no one else.

Shaw—the English were obliged to leave as hostages Captains Van Braam and [Robert] Stobo. They were to be released upon delivery of the twenty-one prisoners, previously captured by Washington, who were then at Williamsburg. Articles—for the safe performance of the treaty and as insurance for the return of the French prisoners taken when Jumonville was assassinated, Captains Van Braam and Stobo were to be held as hostages. The Dinwiddie Letter and the Innes Letter referred to two captains who were hostages. The Villiers Journal mentioned two

⁹² Varin Letter.

hostages. Shaw's was the only account to name them. He gave but one reason for leaving them—the return of the twenty-one prisoners. The Articles also named them and offered two motives—performance of the treaty and return of the prisoners. The Stephen Account mentioned only the reason given by Shaw and blamed the poor translation for inducing the English to sign.

The prisoners were not returned, though Dinwiddie at first gave the order. Later he countermanded it, explaining in a letter to Colonel Innes, August 30, that the French had acted contrary to the law of nations. They had taken Englishmen prisoners after capitulation, had offered them for sale, and, that failing, had sent them to Canada. On September 18 Dinwiddie wrote Innes further that Washington had had no authority in the first place to contract for the release of prisoners, and on September 23 he made similar statements in a letter to the Lords of Trade.⁹³

The Articles were transmitted, Stephen said,⁹⁴ under the most unfavorable conditions—pouring rain, flickering candle, wet and blotted paper, bad writing; Captain Van Braam, the only person able to read them, gave them by word of mouth. The English admission of assassinating Jumonville, about which the French afterward gloated,⁹⁵ was attributed by Stephen to improper translating. His was the only account to picture what took place when the officers signed. Shaw, a private, would scarcely have been present. But he must have suffered from the rain and lack of provisions mentioned both by Stephen and Dinwiddie.⁹⁶ Shaw failed to speak of either in his description of the battle, though at the beginning of his affidavit, he recounted the shortage of food in some detail.

Stephen alone commented upon the intoxicated condition of the men, half of whom became drunk after dark, which was one reason for capitulation. Although his statement was not substantiated, men insuf-

⁹³ Dinwiddie to Innes, August 22, 30, September 18, 1754, in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 293, 298, 320; *id.* to the Lords of Trade, September 23, [1754], *ibid.*, 329.

⁹⁴ Stephen Account.

⁹⁵ Villiers Journal.

⁹⁶ Stephen Account; Dinwiddie Letter; Dinwiddie Newspaper Account.

ficiently fed, with liquor accessible, might easily become drunk. The English must have had plenty of liquor, for Villiers claimed that he burst open their casks to prevent disorder.⁹⁷

The Dinwiddie Letter, the Dinwiddie Newspaper Account, and the Innes Letter told of the pilfering of the baggage by the 100 Indians who joined the morning of evacuation, but this was not mentioned by Shaw. The Villiers Journal maintained that the Indians claimed the right to plunder, Villiers refused them, and the English fled in fear, leaving their tents and one of their colors. The Varin Letter likewise pictured the English fleeing, abandoning even their flag. These details were not depicted in any English version.

Through gossip of Dutch in the French service to Dutch in the English service,⁹⁸ Shaw heard that the French lost 300 men. He thought the loss must have been great, for the English fired continuously all day, but he had no firsthand knowledge. The Dinwiddie Letter and the Dinwiddie Newspaper Account also said the number was uncertain. The Dinwiddie Newspaper Account maintained Dutch gossip placed it at over 300 killed and wounded, and elaborated the French must have had many killed. They were burying their dead all night, and one of the English captured and later released saw many French wounded. The Dinwiddie Letter gave 300 killed plus many wounded, a statement based on the same Dutch gossip. If by "lost" Shaw meant "killed," he was in accord with the Dinwiddie Letter, but he failed to make any provision for the wounded. If he meant "killed and wounded," his estimate was too low. The Innes Letter estimated English deaths as one third of the 100 men killed or wounded, French deaths as double that number. This would mean about 67. The Villiers Journal admitted but two killed, and one "Pany,"⁹⁹ seventeen wounded, two of them Indians. The number of wounded did not include slightly wounded. The Varin Letter said that two French-Canadians were killed and seventy men wounded, two of them Indians.

⁹⁷ Villiers Journal.

⁹⁸ There were several Dutch names on the English rosters. *Washington Papers*, I.

⁹⁹ Name of an Indian. Journal of Coulon de Villiers, in *Olden Time*, II, 213 n.

Shaw maintained that the English lost ten men from the Carolina Company, Lieutenant Mercier being one, and twenty belonging to the Virginia Regiment, a total of thirty. They had many wounded. The Dinwiddie Letter and the Dinwiddie Newspaper Account likewise reported thirty killed and seventy wounded. The Dinwiddie Newspaper Account recounted the death of Lieutenant Mercier of the Independent Company, and Dinwiddie also named him as a casualty in a letter to Secretary Henry Fox, August 15.¹⁰⁰ The Innes Letter placed the losses at 100, one third of them deaths. Villiers wrote in his journal that the number of English dead and wounded moved him to pity notwithstanding they had taken his brother's life. One Indian took ten English prisoners, he added, but he sent them back, a bit of French color not admitted by the English.

The wounded were carried by the Regiment on the first day's march, Shaw said. They then had to be left in care of a party until horses could be sent. He heard that seven died the first night. The death of the seven was not recounted elsewhere. According to the Dinwiddie Letter all the horses and cattle were killed, and the soldiers had to carry the wounded on their backs, finally leaving them with a guard. In the absence of horses and oxen, the Articles said, the English were permitted to hide their property and leave a guard until it could be sent for.

Shaw nowhere mentioned the killing of the animals, unless by implication when he recounted that the wounded remained behind until horses could be sent. The Villiers Journal admitted that the horses and cattle were destroyed. The Stephen Account said the milch cows became the property of the enemy. The Dinwiddie Newspaper Account asserted that the English had to abandon baggage and stores because a shortage of provisions made speed necessary, and that the killing of all animals, even the dogs, had left them no means of transportation. Shaw spoke of abandoning stores and baggage without stating the cause. The retreating English marched to Wills Creek, he said, a statement proved by the roster taken there July 9.¹⁰¹

¹⁰⁰ *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 280.

¹⁰¹ *Washington Papers*, I.

Shaw's story of the request of the sixteen volunteers for discharge, Washington's vain attempt to persuade them to stay, his promise to try to secure a gratuity for them, and their departure in a body was not recounted by anyone else. Washington and Mackay soon set off for Williamsburg,¹⁰² Shaw continued, and their departure was the signal for the men to leave in two's and three's daily. Fully two thirds were gone when he "came off." A roster taken July 9 compared with the pay roll of July 29 shows the large number who had left the service.¹⁰⁸ On August 3 Dinwiddie commented to Washington on the desertions which had occurred during his absence. On August 11 Washington wrote William Fairfax that six men had left the previous night, fearing they were to be called to duty. Only confinement would prevent nightly desertions. On August 20 Washington wrote Dinwiddie that scarcely "a Night, or an opportunity" occurred when some did not desert, "often two, three, or 4 at a time."¹⁰⁴

Only Shaw described the Indian party which deserted under threat to the French before the battle. But there was general agreement with Shaw as to the absence of Indians. Washington told of a council with the Indians, June 21, after which they all left. Although he mentioned later contacts, he spoke of no Indians aiding in battle.¹⁰⁵ They were present at the Council of War at Gist's, June 28, and threatened to leave if return were not made to Great Meadows.¹⁰⁶ Evidently they went anyway. The Half King attributed their action to Washington's attempt to make them fight by his direction.¹⁰⁷ Innes wrote, "We had

¹⁰² Their arrival in town was noted in the *Williamsburg Virginia Gazette*, July 19, 1754, and reprinted in the *Annapolis Maryland Gazette*, July 25, 1754. Apparently they arrived on July 17.

¹⁰³ Washington Papers, I.

¹⁰⁴ Dinwiddie to Washington, August 3, [1754], in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 268; Washington to Fairfax, August 11, 1754, in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 93-94; *id.* to Dinwiddie, August 20, 1754, *ibid.*, 98.

¹⁰⁵ Washington's Journal, in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 88; Washington to Fairfax, August 11, 1754, *ibid.*, 92; *id.* (ed.), *Diaries of George Washington*, I, 101-102.

¹⁰⁶ Washington Papers, I.

¹⁰⁷ Conrad Weiser's Journal, in Hazard (ed.), *Colonial Records of Pennsylvania*, VI, 151-52.

not an *Indian* to assist when the Engagement commenced or ended."¹⁰⁸ The Dinwiddie Letter said some remained, but in general they sided with the conquerors. The Varin Letter prophesied that the Indians would be disgusted with the English because it was their second defeat.

Shaw told of the Half King and his party of about thirty accompanying the English to Wills Creek, and then departing for a place called "Jemmy Arthor in Pensilvania." Montour wrote Governor James Hamilton, July 21, that the Half King, Monacatoocha, and a body of the Six Nations from Ohio came down to the back of Virginia, but would not remain. They departed to settle at Aughwick,¹⁰⁹ located at the mouth of Aughwick Creek where it emptied into the Juniata River. Either Shaw or the person writing his affidavit, unfamiliar with the word "Juniata," garbled it to "Jemmy Arthor."

The Indians' retirement, Shaw said, was due to their fear of other Indians, a statement substantiated by their flight and by the writings of persons in touch with them.¹¹⁰ The departure of the two Indian scouts is corroborated only by the proof already offered that the English had no Indian aid in the battle.

III SUMMARY

The foregoing analysis has endeavored to show the truth or falsity of the John Shaw Affidavit by comparing it with contemporary accounts and documents. The summary will balance pros and cons in an effort to determine validity, how Shaw obtained his information, and whether he was actually a member of Washington's expedition.

Shaw was illiterate, unable even to sign his name, as his mark testifies; yet the English of his affidavit is not that of a common man, and must have been changed by the person writing it. Shaw would hardly have used such words as "confusion," "deponent," "contradicted," "endeavored," "provisions," "deceit," "assurances," "capitu-

¹⁰⁸ Innes Letter.

¹⁰⁹ Andrew Montour to Hamilton, July 21, 1754, in Hazard (ed.), *Colonial Records of Pennsylvania*, VI, 130; George Croghan to *id.*, August 16, 1754, *ibid.*, VI, 140-41.

¹¹⁰ Croghan to Hamilton, August 16, 1754, *ibid.*; Captain Robert Stobo to *id.*, July 29 1754, *ibid.*, VI, 141-42; Croghan to Richard Peters, December 23, 1754, in *id.* (ed.), *Pennsylvania Archives*, Ser. I, Vol. II, 218.

late," "engaged," "gratuity." He would have spoken simpler language with more errors in grammar. Probably the writer followed Shaw's general outline because the style is rambling and ambiguous. Being sworn to, an affidavit carried penalties for perjury and had more weight than a mere statement.

If John Shaw's name appeared on the roster taken July 9 at Wills Creek there would be little question of his participation in the battle of Fort Necessity. But his name is neither there nor on other rosters of the period,¹¹¹ despite the record of the John Shaw who enlisted on motion of Andrew Lewis in Augusta County, March 23.¹¹²

As already stated, six of the seven men who took the oath with Shaw were included in a return of Captain Andrew Lewis's company, July 9. John Shaw and William Pere were omitted. Nor were they among the wounded, missing, or deserted.¹¹³ Andrew Lewis, who had sworn them in, and who owned a tract of land near Shaw's, probably knew them personally, which makes the omission more significant.¹¹⁴ That the rosters were inaccurate is apparent. Although there is record of enlistment for all eight men on March 23, the commissary's pay roll of May 29 omitted not only John Shaw and William Pere but two others who appeared on Lewis's return and elsewhere.¹¹⁵ This pay roll also had the dates of enlistment for the four included, as respectively March 9, 24, 25, and April 7.¹¹⁶ The name of one was spelled George McSwain instead of George McSwine.

Moreover, in a list of English prisoners and deserters made at Fort Duquesne, July 29, by Captain Stobo, a hostage, there are several names of men supposed to have served in the expedition which cannot be found on other rosters.¹¹⁷ Montour and his company of scouts and rangers are also not recorded.¹¹⁸

¹¹¹ Washington Papers, I.

¹¹² Chalkley (comp.), *Chronicles*, I, 62.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*; Washington Papers, I.

¹¹⁴ Chalkley (comp.), *Chronicles*, I, 62, 442; III, 31, 32.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 62; Washington Papers, I.

¹¹⁶ Washington Papers, I.

¹¹⁷ "A list of Deserters and Prisoners at the French Fort," in Hazard (ed.), *Colonial Records of Pennsylvania*, VI, 142-43; Washington Papers, I.

¹¹⁸ Hanna, *Wilderness Trail*, I, 230; Dinwiddie to Sharpe, December 17, 1754; Jan-

Was John Shaw, the seaman, identical with John Shaw, the landowner? Both John and Shaw were common names. There might have been several John Shaws in Virginia. John Shaw, the seaman, was vague regarding his past. He was in His Majesty's service until after the war (October, 1748). He was then employed in the merchant service trading with Virginia. If identical with the landowner, his sea service must have ended July, 1750, when his career as landowner began.¹¹⁹ He took up his habitation on the Cow Pasture; petitioned with others, 1751-1752, for a road; and was a recognized inhabitant as shown by land deeds taken out near his property.¹²⁰ Augusta County was too far inland to permit a dual role as seaman and resident landowner.

As a landowner, he should have had more information regarding the encouragement offered for land settlement. The Dinwiddie proclamation required service in return for land.¹²¹ If the "Proposals" mentioned by the seaman referred to this document, he must have known service was demanded, which would nullify his claim that he was "thrown into the Virginia Regiment," a statement intended to excuse perhaps his subsequent admission that he "came off." A man forced to serve has better reason for desertion than a volunteer. Whatever the truth of the seaman's assertion, the record shows that the landowner volunteered.¹²² But statements regarding a note which he owed indicate that the landowner, like the seaman, was a runaway. The first reference to this note was made March 15, 1755. His departure must have occurred some time prior to that date, and the motive must have been urgent, for he left his land, his debt, and even a note due him and took "French leave."¹²³ Both seaman and landowner as this study has tried to show served in Muse's detachment. The seaman said he was Irish; the land-

uary 7, 1755, in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 426, 450; "A list of Deserters and Prisoners at the French Fort," in Hazard (ed.), *Colonial Records of Pennsylvania*, VI, 142-43.

¹¹⁹ Chalkley (comp.), *Chronicles*, II, 383.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, I, 438, 44, 442, 443; III, 31, 32.

¹²¹ Annapolis *Maryland Gazette*, March 7, 1754.

¹²² Chalkley (comp.), *Chronicles*, I, 62.

¹²³ *Ibid.*, III, 37, 51; I, 315.

owner came from a Scotch-Irish settlement.¹²⁴ But the seaman claimed longer service than was possible for the landowner.

The two men present different pictures to the imagination. One from his own account was a foot-loose seaman who happened to be in Virginia when proposals were made for settling land, embraced them, and was "thrown" into service. The other was a settled inhabitant who took up 200 acres in Augusta County, lived on them four years, possessed sufficient means to lend money, though the amount was probably small, and enlisted voluntarily.¹²⁵

Could two John Shaws have joined Washington's comparatively small force? Could both have been omitted from the rosters? Could both have been in Muse's regiment and both have run away?

There is a bare chance that "John Shaw," a common name, was assumed by the seaman to avoid apprehension and punishment. The name might have been suggested to him by an encounter with John Shaw, the landowner. Having entered South Carolina under an assumed name, the seaman might have been afraid to resume his own even though he felt safe enough to say boldly he "came off." This is pure supposition in a presentation of possibilities. If true, the similarities between the two men are remarkable.

Whether seaman, landowner, or both, John Shaw could have secured his account from eyewitnesses, hearsay, personal experience, or published sources. He claimed it came from the first three.

Unable to read, he could not have consulted a paper himself, but might have heard one read. The Jumonville affair was in print¹²⁶ some time before he left the colony. But the men with whom he naturally would associate were illiterate. Besides, he made no claim to firsthand information about the Jumonville episode, saying he had his story from those who were present.

The account of the battle of Fort Necessity appeared in the Williams-

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 3; II, 383.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 44, 62, 315, 438, 442, 443; III, 31, 32.

¹²⁶ Annapolis *Maryland Gazette*, June 13, 1754; Philadelphia *Pennsylvania Gazette*, June 27, 1754. The account in the Williamsburg *Virginia Gazette* must have antedated the others, but copies for this period cannot be located.

burg *Virginia Gazette*, July 19. If Shaw were not at Wills Creek with Washington's forces, it, too, could have been read to him. If he were at Wills Creek, he could not have come in contact with this paper before he was supposed to have started south. There are no means of knowing how he traveled. The authors found only one ship from Virginia which docked at this time in South Carolina. That one arrived July 27 and had been a week coming from Hampton. There was gossip aboard of a French attack on the English, but the brief statement published in the Charleston *South-Carolina Gazette*, August 1, was so erroneous that no reference has been made to it. If Shaw's account were correct, he could hardly have reached Hampton in time to take this ship.¹²⁷ Whatever his method of transportation he was in Charleston, August 27. On the way he could have encountered men who had heard of the battle or had been in it. Neither Glen nor Dinwiddie, who received Shaw's account from Glen, questioned Shaw's ability to make the journey in the six weeks at his disposal, though Dinwiddie was anxious to discredit him.¹²⁸

In the main Shaw's affidavit differed in details, sequence, and wording from the newspaper accounts of the battle of Fort Necessity copied from the Dinwiddie Newspaper Account in the *Virginia Gazette*. Similarities are noted below:

Referring to the sentry, Shaw said—"fired his Peice"; the Dinwiddie Newspaper Account—"firing his Piece." Speaking of Washington's refusal of the French offer to parley, Shaw said—"Imagining it might be some Deceit"; Dinwiddie Newspaper Account—"we suspected a Deceit." Both Shaw and the paper said Captain Van Braam and Adjutant Peyronie were sent to parley. Both names appear in no other accounts. That Peyronie's was probably an error is shown in the preceding analysis. Speaking of the Indians who joined the French the morning after surrender, Shaw said—"who could hardly be Restrained by them from falling on our People"; Dinwiddie Newspaper Account—"who were hardly restrained from attacking us." Shaw—"This De-

¹²⁷ Charleston *South-Carolina Gazette*, August 1, 1754.

¹²⁸ Dinwiddie to Glen, October 25, 1754, in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 377.

ponent has heard that some Dutch Men who were along with the French told some Dutch Men who were with us That they had lost three hundred Men"; Dinwiddie Newspaper Account—"The Number killed and wounded of the Enemy is uncertain, but by the Information given by some Dutch in their Service to their Countrymen in ours, we learn that it amounted to above 300." The gossip of Dutchmen may have been common talk among the men. Otherwise the similarity is significant.

If Shaw had heard the Dinwiddie Newspaper Account, he omitted many points and changed others. The paper gave as the understanding with the French that each side should retire without molestation—the French to Monongahela, the English to Wills Creek. Shaw's understanding was much closer to the Articles of Capitulation. The Dinwiddie Newspaper Account reported Lieutenant Mercier of Mackay's Independent Company killed; Shaw—Lieutenant Mercier of the Carolina Company, another name for the Independent Company. The newspaper described, as Shaw did not, the rain; the trenches full of water; the expectation that the French would force the trenches, which caused the English to reserve fire; the inability to understand why a vastly superior force offered parley; the robbing of the baggage; the killing of the animals and resulting handicap. These facts were in other accounts and were significant omissions in Shaw's, but all accounts omitted something and Shaw's contained the essentials.

He could not have had his story wholly from the paper, for his affidavit gave material not in the news story, details told only by him or by him and sources not open to him. This meant he had to be an eyewitness, had to receive his information from an eyewitness, or possess a good imagination. He said he saw the bones of the French dead, a circumstance mentioned only in the Villiers Journal, not accessible to Shaw. Shaw and Stephen alone recounted what occurred from the warning of the French approach until the retreating English reached Fort Necessity. Shaw's affidavit was made in Charleston, August 27; the Stephen Account was published in the *Pennsylvania Gazette*, August 22, too late to have afforded Shaw any information. Shaw mentioned

carrying the wounded on the first day's march and leaving them with a guard. A similar statement appeared only in the Dinwiddie Letter to the Board of Trade, to which Shaw had no access. Shaw told of the Half King and his party going to Wills Creek and leaving for "Jemmy Arthor," a statement corroborated in general by Andrew Montour and George Croghan in letters not open to Shaw.¹²⁹ He said no Indians participated on the English side in the battle of Fort Necessity, another statement substantiated by sources closed to him.¹³⁰ The firing of swivel guns was described solely by Shaw and the Villiers Journal, from which he had no way to secure data. The desertions of the men recounted by him were also told elsewhere only in documents he could not have obtained.¹³¹

He alone pictured the desertion of the Indian party before the battle of Fort Necessity, without revealing the source of his information. His was the sole mention of the twenty-two gentlemen's sons or cadets who enlisted, a circumstance corroborated only by the roster of July 3, on which two appear.¹³² He alone told about the sixteen volunteers. His story must have come from hearsay, as he probably was not present during their conversation with Washington. He was the only individual to give exact rations—several days with but a quart of Indian corn per man and three days with only one pound of beef each without any corn. Although others spoke of the woods, he alone said the French Indians advanced out of them to meet death under English fire. He furnished the one careful description of the house and "Stocado Fort," and said the French fired at such close range that the English were wounded by splinters beaten off the house by bullets. He alone gave

¹²⁹ Montour to Hamilton, July 21, 1754, in Hazard (ed.), *Colonial Records of Pennsylvania*, VI, 130; Croghan to *id.*, August 16, 1754, *ibid.*, 140-41; *id.* to Peters, December 23, 1754, in *id.* (ed.), *Pennsylvania Archives*, Ser. I, Vol. II, 218.

¹³⁰ Washington's Journal, in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 88; Washington to Fairfax, August 11, 1754, *ibid.*, 92; *id.* (ed.), *Diaries of George Washington*, I, 101-102; Washington Papers, I; Conrad Weiser's Journal, in Hazard (ed.), *Colonial Records of Pennsylvania*, VI, 151-52; Innes Letter; Dinwiddie Letter; Varin Letter.

¹³¹ Washington Papers, I; Dinwiddie to Washington, August 3, [1754], in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 268; Washington to Fairfax, August 11, 1754, in Fitzpatrick (ed.), *Writings of Washington*, I, 93-94; *id.* to Dinwiddie, August 20, 1754, *ibid.*, 98.

¹³² Washington Papers, I.

names to the hostages, and the names were correct. The Articles of Capitulation, which were in print and could have been read to him, also named the hostages.¹⁸³ Only his affidavit described the breaking of the powder barrels and strewing of the powder. He alone told of the enemy's forming into two ranks for the English to pass through. He alone said seven of the wounded died the first night after having been left behind. And his was the only account to divide the dead into ten from the Carolina Company and twenty from the Virginia Regiment.

All the events mentioned by him alone could have happened; the majority were corroborated in part, as shown by the preceding analysis. Most of the facts told only by him and by sources not open to him were contained in that part of his affidavit for which he claimed firsthand knowledge.

He said he was not present in the Jumonville affair, and the one thing he saw himself was the bones of the French dead. With few exceptions, such as the episode of the sixteen volunteers and the Indian desertion, he thus distinguished between his own experiences and those told him. He believed about one hundred in all took up the land proposals. He believed that the gentlemen's sons received no pay. He "heard that the Half King had Sixty Indians with him who were in our Interest" but "never saw above fforty." He "heard that some Dutch Men" etc., but did not know it of his own knowledge. He heard that seven died the first night. These admissions, especially his willing statement that he was not in the Jumonville encounter, lend support to those portions of his affidavit for which he claimed eyewitness knowledge.

A comparison of his alleged secondhand account with his alleged firsthand material shows the former less accurate and more summarized. He combined arrival and departure of messengers, troops, and Indians; gave little more than half the number in Hogg's detachment; described the death of Jumonville with the exaggeration common in a story

¹⁸³ *Philadelphia Pennsylvania Gazette*, July 25, 1754; *Annapolis Maryland Gazette*, August 1, 1754. They probably appeared in the *Williamsburg Virginia Gazette*, but copies for this period cannot be located.

grown large with repetition. Also the secondhand material comprised but a comparatively small part of the affidavit.

The firsthand account was more detailed, explicit, and vivid except the beginning regarding the land proclamation and the raising of troops, about which he naturally had less information. His knowledge of the Articles of Capitulation was correct in a way which induces belief that he was present. He gave them mainly as events which followed the surrender. Had he not been there and heard them often, would he have recalled such names as Van Braam, Stobo, Peyronie, Mercier? He had them all with correct rank. Van Braam and Peyronie were misspelled, but Shaw was not responsible. "Jumonville," the one difficult name secured from hearsay, he apparently could not recall, referring to him as the "ffrench Captain." Also he garbled "Juniata," which probably was mentioned infrequently, into "Jemmy Arthor."

On the other hand, he was consistently vague about time. His account contained no dates. He spoke of "some days" intervening between the start of the first and second detachments; a "few days" separating the engagement with the French and the joining of the second detachment; "Sometime" elapsing after Mackay joined before Washington marched to attack the French fort. The road making lasted "about three days," patently inaccurate unless he spoke merely of one short period. He did set 2:00 A.M. as the hour of Mackay's arrival and 9:00 to 10:00 A.M. as the hour the French appeared. The first was substantiated only by Stephen's statement that Mackay arrived at night. The second was incorrect. This vagueness regarding time could be due to temperament, laxness, forgetfulness, or the fact that he was not an eyewitness and so lacked such details.

Also he failed to stress physical discomforts. The rain was heavy and handicapping in both engagements, and Shaw supposedly experienced it himself in the Battle of Fort Necessity. The men were without shelter, and in trenches full of water; yet he said nothing about it. He did recount at the beginning of his affidavit the shortage of provisions, but not his own hunger. He did not mention the drunkenness described by Stephen and only by him. Nor did Shaw speak of the long trek back

from Gist House over a rough, hilly road, the men being forced to draw the swivels, the scarcity of horses making them carry baggage and ammunition, the refusal of Mackay's men to assist and the adverse reaction on the Virginia Regiment, the arrival exhausted at Great Meadows—all portrayed vividly by the Stephen Account and corroborated in part by the Council of War at Gist's, June 28.¹⁸⁴ Hunger, fatigue, wetness, drunkenness—none of these sensations were told by Shaw. His affidavit had the impersonal tone of the secondhand accounts rather than the more personal slant given by the eyewitnesses, Villiers and Stephen. This could be the fault of the individual who took down Shaw's words and doubtless corrected his English.

How much information did Glen have before Shaw made his affidavit on August 27? The Articles of Capitulation were not published in the Charleston *South-Carolina Gazette* until September 19; so he probably had not seen them. No doubt he had read the account of the Jumonville episode which appeared in the *South-Carolina Gazette*, August 8, and the Dinwiddie Newspaper Account of the Battle of Fort Necessity reprinted in the *South-Carolina Gazette*, August 22. A copy of the account was also enclosed in a letter to him from Dinwiddie, dated August 5.¹⁸⁵ With such data, Glen could have asked questions, made suggestions, added material, changed the wording. This might account for similarities to the Dinwiddie Newspaper Account though it would be a very questionable procedure in a sworn statement.

In his replies to Dinwiddie, September 10, Glen included all or part of Shaw's affidavit, which was sweepingly denounced by Dinwiddie in his answer, October 25. "The Acc't you have, and depend on, from John Shaw, tho' swore to, is certainly false, and I suppose he is a Deserter and ought to be put in Prison and returned here."¹⁸⁶ Dinwiddie's anger was aroused in part by the jealousy and disagreement of the two governors over Indian affairs and by the criticism in Glen's letters

¹⁸⁴ Washington Papers, I.

¹⁸⁵ Dinwiddie to Glen, August 5, [1754], in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 275.

¹⁸⁶ *Id.* to *id.*, October 25, 1754, *ibid.*, 377. The contents of Glen's letters are revealed in this reply of Dinwiddie.

of Dinwiddie's course of action. Dinwiddie said he felt he had cause to complain of the "method and Substance" of Glen's letters.¹⁸⁷

Dinwiddie's charge that Shaw's account was false, the analysis shows to be incorrect. But portions of the affidavit, if included by Glen, might easily have aroused Dinwiddie's ire—the garbling of Dinwiddie's proclamation regarding land; the impressment of men because of inability to secure enlistments; the gruesome description of the killing of Jumonville; the humiliating terms of capitulation, not given in the newspaper account Dinwiddie sent Glen, though published elsewhere; the inefficiency revealed through failure to pay the troops, lack of provisions, inability to secure and keep Indian assistance; Indian preference for the French; and the large number of desertions.

Despite his anger, Dinwiddie did not accuse Shaw of getting his story secondhand but labeled him a deserter. That Glen was convinced of its authenticity is indicated by his forwarding it to Dinwiddie with some such statement, for Dinwiddie refers to it as "The Acc't you have, and depend on."¹⁸⁸ Also Glen regarded it as sufficiently important to present to the Council to be made part of the record and sent to England.

Weight of evidence inclines one to the belief that Shaw was a member of the expedition. He knew his story too well to have secured it all from hearsay unless he had an unusual ability for remembering detailed information accurately. His affidavit followed no account closely enough to have been copied and contained many facts which appeared nowhere else or only in material not open to him. Although he might have hoped to enjoy temporary prestige, that motive was insufficient to induce him to incur risk of punishment by perjuring himself before the Governor.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*; Hayes Baker-Crothers, *Virginia and the French and Indian War* (Chicago, 1928), 43-45.

¹⁸⁸ Dinwiddie to Glen, August 5, [1754], in Brock (ed.), *Dinwiddie Records*, I, 377.

The Seventh Annual Meeting of the Southern Historical Association

BY THOMAS D. CLARK

The Southern Historical Association held its seventh annual meeting in the Atlanta-Biltmore Hotel at Atlanta, Georgia, on November 6, 7, and 8, 1941. First indications were that attendance would fall considerably below that of previous meetings, but when final registration was completed, there were 220 registrants in comparison with the record high of 278 at Charleston in 1940. At Atlanta the program was more inclusive than previously, including eight sections on southern, two on European, one on Latin-American, and one on local history. Thus, there were brought together a larger variety of historical interests and scholarship than had been assembled heretofore. An outstanding feature of the program was the degree of harmonious and mutual interest prevailing among scholars representing the various fields of historical endeavor. There was a wholesome crossing of special lines of interest to attend the various sessions. The European and Latin American sections were well attended, and some of the discussions which followed the reading of the papers were the liveliest parts of the meeting. The local history papers were well flavored with sparkling wit and humor.

The southern history programs were planned to cover the social history of the region, with emphasis upon the New South. Obviously it was impractical to devote attention solely to the more recent period because of the relatively few persons particularly interested in it and the lack of research in this era of the South's history. At the opening of one section, the remark was made that the Program Committee had

attempted to steer clear of the Civil War and Reconstruction. Then an expression of the belief that the war and its aftermath perhaps formed the heart of southern history brought applause. The Committee, however, did not avoid these colorful periods through antipathy to them, but rather through a feeling that certain parts of southern history were being neglected, and that men who have done good work in the later period deserved an opportunity to present their findings in papers before the Association.

On Thursday afternoon the meeting began with two sessions on southern history. Professor Henry T. Shanks of Birmingham-Southern College presided over the section devoted to "Newspapers as a Factor in Southern Development." Professor Granville T. Prior of The Citadel read the first paper, "Henry Laurens Pinckney and the Charleston *Mercury*." Professor Prior gave a summary of Pinckney's life and of the newspaper situation in Charleston at the time the *Mercury* reached the point of its greatest influence. He traced Pinckney's views toward national issues in the period from the beginning of Calhoun's rise to national importance through the Jacksonian era, emphasizing especially the editor's part in the nullification controversy. In summarizing, the speaker said that under Pinckney's leadership the *Mercury* became a newspaper whose influence reached beyond municipal and state affairs into the broad field of national politics. Professor James W. Silver of the University of Mississippi presented a paper pertaining to the New South entitled, "C. P. J. Mooney of the Memphis *Commercial-Appeal*, Crusader for Diversification." Professor Silver dealt with the activities of a vigorous apostle of the New South, who became a philosophical pivot for the tristate area centering in Memphis. Like "Marse" Henry Watterson of an earlier generation, Mooney was quick to take up the fight for his section's economic welfare. He lived in an area where erosion, tenant farming, poor diet, one-crop agriculture, and lack of scientific livestock breeding took a heavy toll of both land and human resources. Mooney was an agrarian who believed that only land could offer the Southerner a decent amount of security, and he labored to revive the economic wealth of the section through scientific agricultural

practices. Professor Silver's good analysis of this virile southern leader should be provocative of similar study on a broader scale. Original plans for this session had provided for the treatment of a third newspaper in the period between that of Pinckney's *Mercury* and Mooney's *Commercial-Appeal*, but this study had to be cancelled. This omission placed Professor Culver H. Smith of the University of Chattanooga at a disadvantage in his criticism of the two papers, because of the lack of continuity of time. He began his discussion by stating the various approaches which a student of newspaper history might take. He might make a biographical study of the editor; a chronology of newsgathering and presentation from the mechanical ends of publication; a measure of contemporary public opinion as it was reflected in the newspaper; or a measure of the influence of the newspaper upon its readers. He raised the question whether the two studies read had not dealt too directly with the opinions of the editors, thereby inadequately indicating the influence of the newspapers themselves on southern development, particularly in view of the program theme and the titles of the two studies. Professor Smith also pointed out the difficulty of measuring the influence of a newspaper on its readers. This observation was especially applicable, he believed, to such a paper as that on Mooney and his fight for diversification.

Professor Stanley J. Folmsbee of the University of Tennessee presided over the second session, which treated southern transportation and trade. The first paper, "Mobile: Ante-Bellum Factorage Center of the Alabama-Tombigbee Basin," was read by Professor Charles S. Davis of the Alabama Polytechnic Institute. Professor Davis traced the rise of Mobile as a factorage center beginning in the early nineteenth century. He used statistics pertaining to population growth and cotton sales to show the growth of the port from 1815 to 1860. He treated the history of river navigation and the expansion of the cotton belt upstream, and summarized the growth in importance of Mobile factors and commission merchants. Professor J. A. Durrenberger of the Georgia State Woman's College next presented a paper on "The Toll Road Movement in the Middle Atlantic States and Maryland." Cover-

ing a broad scope of transportation history, he outlined the growth of the toll roads in the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and the changes necessitated by the coming of motorized vehicles, with the need for improved highway facilities. The emphasis of the paper was upon the network of roads leading west from the Middle Atlantic states, and the methods of financing their construction. The third paper, "Railroad Regulation in Alabama Politics," was read by Professor James F. Doster of the University of Alabama. The author presented an able analysis of the political situation which prevailed in Alabama in the 1880's and 1890's. He traced the history of the power lobbies, the intercompany organizations, and the tightening of the noose of non-competition around the neck of the Alabama shipper. The fight begun by B. B. Comer to bring about equitable regulation of the railroads led to ultimate victory in 1913, when the support of the United States government was won.

On Thursday evening the southern history section was devoted to the subject of postwar southern political leaders. Professor Alfred W. Garner of Mississippi State College presided. Professor Arndt M. Stickles, Western Kentucky State Teachers College, introduced his paper, "Simon Bolivar Buckner, Conservative Governor with Vision," with a biographical sketch of his subject. Buckner, a backwoods Kentuckian with an urbane finish, was one of the most colorful characters in a state where colorful characters have been plentiful. He served with distinction in the armed forces of both the United States and the Confederacy. In 1887 he became governor and during his term gained distinction for having vetoed more bills than all the governors before him. A good businessman and an honest governor, Buckner ran the state with the same foresight and judgment with which he managed his own affairs. When he retired from the governorship, he was more popular than when he was elected—a record for a Kentucky governor. Professor George C. Osborn of Bob Jones College read a paper entitled, "John Sharp Williams, Humorist." Professor Osborn dealt with this unpredictable Mississippian with a degree of finesse worthy of the Old Master. He recited many of the witty Senator's anecdotes and sharp

turns of speech. Williams crossed swords with all comers and in extemporaneous debate had few equals. He retired from the Senate in March, 1923, a disillusioned old man. In the third paper, "John Nance Garner and the Democratic Reaction, 1920-1922," Professor Alex M. Arnett of the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina presented intimate ins and outs of Democratic party politics. In the period under discussion, Garner was trying to lead his party into a path of Harding-Coolidge conservatism. "Garner," said Professor Arnett, "was a liberal only when liberalism paid political dividends." A full history of the fight between Garner and Claude Kitchin was then presented. Kitchin fought against the heavy odds of rapidly failing health and Garner's political chicanery. As one of his last acts, Kitchin got the Democratic caucus to make Finis Garrett his successor as minority leader, thus continuing for a time liberal control of the party's congressional activities. Professor Arnett gave evidence of having made adequate use of the Kitchin Papers.

Simultaneously with the program on postwar leaders, there was held a session on "Some Aspects of Latin-American History." Professor A. B. Thomas of the University of Alabama presided. Dean Alan K. Manchester of Duke University presented a paper on "Elections in Brazil during the Empire: A Study in Practical Politics." Dr. Manchester stated at the outset that he did not pretend to answer the question of why the sectionalized empire emerged from the struggle for independence as one political entity. He proposed a line of approach to the question and suggested other probable solutions. One of his conclusions was that the Brazilian empire was susceptible to a highly centralized government which kept the parts from becoming individual states. This centralization was made easier by such processes as indirect elections, a restricted electorate, imperial patronage, and complex electoral regulations—all of which should be studied further. Peculiarities of the electoral system had the effect of giving to the emperor control over the composition of the House of Deputies. In suggesting that the machinery of elections during the empire must be considered as a powerful centralizing force, Dean Manchester has made possible a more

satisfactory explanation of early Brazilian unity. Professor Harris G. Warren of Louisiana State University discussed "Filibustering during the War of 1812." "The filibustering decade from 1812 to 1821," he said, "marked the culmination of numerous threats to Spanish sovereignty in the Viceroyalty of New Spain." The first three years of this period coincided with a general world upheaval. Americans were ready "to invade Texas in search of profit, land, and adventure." This desire gave the agents of the Mexican rebels support for a raid into the eastern internal provinces of New Spain. José Bernardo Gutiérrez de Lara from northern Mexico and José Álvarez de Toledo from Cuba and Santo Domingo attempted to interest the United States in schemes hostile to Spain. The Gutiérrez-Magee expedition was organized, and an invasion of Mexico was begun in August, 1812. Recruits from the "Neutral Ground" were supplied by merchants from New Orleans and Natchitoches. The expedition, after changing commanders many times, failed. Other filibusterers who followed were John Hamilton Robinson, General Jean Humbert, and Juan Pablo Anaya. These filibustering raids convinced Spain that Texas territory could not be defended if the United States decided to invade it. With the peace of 1815, Spain lost hope of securing British support and was left with diplomacy as the only channel open to stem the tide of American expansion. Professor Lee F. Crippen read a paper prepared by his colleague at Berea College, E. Taylor Parks, on "American Contributions to the Modernization of Ecuador." After giving a brief summary of the geography and population of Ecuador, Professor Parks pointed out that numbers of American business and professional men went to Ecuador in the early nineteenth century, followed by a stream of other enterprisers. He gave a full account of the activities of the various American corporations entering the Ecuadorian field as well as a history of American loans to Ecuador businessmen. He showed also that American experts have been invited occasionally to straighten out financial tangles. Nevertheless, Professor Parks is of the opinion that the North American entrepreneur "has yet to discover the profit possibilities in the economic development of Ecuador."

One of the high lights of the annual meeting was the Friday morning session dealing with the broad aspect of southern history. Professor William C. Binkley of Vanderbilt University presided, and Professor Emeritus William O. Lynch of Indiana University read a paper, "The South and Its History." Members of the discussion panel were Professors Fletcher M. Green, University of North Carolina, leader, E. Merton Coulter, University of Georgia, and Charles W. Ramsdell, University of Texas. Professor Lynch began his discussion with a presentation of the numerous geographical factors influential in southern history. By careful alignment of these facts, he defined the region. Then he examined many of the salient political and economic features which have made the South a separate entity in the nation. One of these was the failure of southern leaders to appreciate the necessity for a controlled agricultural system. In the latter part of his discussion, Professor Lynch predicted that the time was rapidly coming when southern solidarity would be a thing of the past, because of changes within the section since the Civil War and pressures which have been brought to bear upon the region from outside by industrial development and migration. He touched upon the significance of intersectional social intercourse, which is rapidly breaking down the old lines of solidarity and provincialism.

As the Program Committee had hoped, Professor Lynch's paper stimulated much discussion. Professor Green emphasized factors other than geographical ones which have helped to develop southern solidarity. He pointed out the homogeneity of the people, the plantation system with its agrarian way of life, the general economic organization of the South, the system of local government, the effects of slavery and the abolition crusade, and the political, social, and economic philosophies preached by such men as Thomas R. Dew, William Harper, George Fitzhugh, William Gilmore Simms, and Josiah C. Nott. Professor Green disagreed with the view that southern leaders did not recognize the need for a controlled agricultural program, and cited proposals made by Dimas Pence advocating a general scheme of crop control similar to that of the New Deal, even in the details of state, county,

and individual farmer allotments. This speaker cautioned that in any adequate account of southern history, recognition of the contributions of the South to the social, economic, cultural, and political life of the United States would have to be made. Professor Coulter discussed the subject of southern solidarity as reflected in its politics, its economic needs, and its reactions to Reconstruction. Professor Ramsdell treated the development of the southern system as reflected in slavery, and the general factors which attended its growth and destruction. Following Professor Coulter's line of discussion somewhat, he developed further the idea of political factors that have set the South apart as a section within the nation. There was some discussion from the floor.

Concurrently with the above meeting was held the first European session, which discussed "History and Population in the Middle Ages." The presiding officer, Professor Charles E. Smith of Louisiana State University, presented Miss Eva M. Sanford of Sweetbriar College, who read the first paper, "The Study of Ancient History in the Middle Ages." She stated that there was a definite interest in the subject of ancient history among medieval historians and teachers. Among the topics most often studied were the fall of Troy, the regal period of Rome, the reign of Alexander and the Hellenistic Age, the late Roman Republic, and the Roman Empire. Illustrations were given of the use of ancient history in elementary education. Miss Sanford gave some citations from Peter of Blois and John of Salisbury to show the character of their interest in ancient history and their use of it in evaluating their own times. This paper was discussed by Professor Truesdell S. Brown of the University of Texas. "The Influence of Population upon European History" was the subject of the next paper, read by Professor Josiah C. Russell of the University of North Carolina. He contended that "Thomas Malthus has influenced historical thought upon the place of population in history as that of an effect, until little attention has been given to the possible influence of population upon the course of history. . . . The Malthus theory of involuntary control of population by economic factors is clearly inadequate to explain the population of his own day." Most of the paper was devoted to a discussion of the

methods of population study throughout the sweep of European history. In his conclusion, Professor Russell examined the factors which have affected population.

At the afternoon session, which had as its general subject "Scientific Development in the South," Professor Charles S. Sydnor of Duke University substituted as chairman for Professor Thomas S. Staples of Hendrix College, who was unable to attend the meeting. Professor F. Garvin Davenport of Transylvania College read a paper on "Robert Peter, A Versatile Scientist." He gave a brief biographical sketch of Dr. Peter as background to a discussion of his long and successful career at Transylvania University and at the Kentucky Agricultural and Mechanical College. Robert Peter's many interests led him into the fields of geology, horticulture, botany, meteorology, medicine, and chemistry. As a member of the Geological Survey of Kentucky of 1854, and as a pioneer in agricultural chemistry, he made his greatest contributions to the state. Because of the flooded conditions west of the Mississippi River, Professor Gerald Forbes of Northeastern Oklahoma State College was unable to attend the meeting to present his paper, "The Modern Golden Fleece." Professor Rosser H. Taylor, Furman University, concluded the program with a discussion of "The Sale and Application of Commercial Fertilizers in the Southeast." He traced briefly the use of commercial fertilizers in the South, from the importations of Peruvian guano in 1843 to the present. By the end of the Civil War, there was a growing demand for commercial fertilizers. Some of the definite results of the wider sale were the extension of cotton and tobacco belts, the abandonment of much alluvial lowlands subject to floods, the neglect of compost heaps, the larger yields per acre, the removal of the fertilizer industry to the South, and the development of South Carolina, Tennessee, and Florida phosphate mines.

The second European section also met on Friday afternoon, with Professor Ross H. McLean of Emory University presiding. Professor John F. Ramsey of the University of Alabama presented a paper on "The Revolt of the French Parlements, 1787-1788: Prelude to Revolution," which was judiciously discussed by Professor Harold T. Parker, Duke

University. Professor J. Huntley Dupre of the University of Kentucky read a paper on "What Was the Committee of Public Safety?" He summarized the history of the Convention, and showed that the Committee of Public Safety was established to meet the crisis caused by threatened counterrevolution at home and external threat from a coalition of powers. Functionally, the committee soon became dictatorial; its duties were consolidated by codifying legislation, which allowed it to continue in power until the Convention was succeeded by the Directory. After a careful examination of the various statements which historians have made concerning the Committee of Public Safety, he concluded that any similarities between cabinets in the normal constitutional government of the Third Republic and the Committee of Public Safety in revolutionary and warring France appear to be entirely superficial. This paper and the discussion of it by James L. Godfrey, University of North Carolina, provoked the warmest exchanges of the whole meeting. Professor Godfrey took many exceptions to Professor Dupre's paper, and defenders of both points of views were quick to express their opinions.

The annual dinner, which was held on Friday, was well attended. The Honorable John M. Slaton, a former governor of Georgia, presided. Benjamin B. Kendrick of the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, and president of the Southern Historical Association, read as his presidential address a provocative paper on "The Colonial Status of the South." Professor Kendrick traced historically the colonial subserviency of the South to other sections of the country. He examined the factors which have tended to keep the South in a colonial status from the period of settlement to the present. As this paper is published elsewhere in this issue of the *Journal*, it is not necessary to give a lengthy summary of it; but record should be made of the very favorable impression which the address and its presentation made upon the audience.

On Saturday morning there were two sessions, one devoted to "Southern Economy and Politics" and the other to "Local Historians and the Development of Southern Historical Scholarship." Professor Richard A. McLemore of Mississippi Southern College presided over the first

session, and introduced Professor Glenn N. Sisk, Woman's College of the University of North Carolina, who read a paper on "Some Social and Economic Trends in the Alabama Black Belt, 1880-1930." The first part of the paper described the geography of the region. An analysis of population changes and economic reverses led to the conclusion that the Alabama black belt is tending to become a nonrow crop country. In the absence of Dr. Percy Scott Flippin of The National Archives, his paper, "Herschel V. Johnson and the Compromise of 1850," was read by Professor Walter B. Posey of Birmingham-Southern College. Dr. Flippin presented much of the material he had found in the Johnson Papers. Johnson's attitude toward the Compromise was traced through his correspondence with various political leaders. Dr. Flippin concluded that "Johnson was a staunch supporter of the Union but held tenaciously to the constitutional principles upon which the Union was originally founded, that is, the compact between the states for the purpose of establishing the Union." Mr. James S. Ferguson, Louisiana State University, read a paper on "The Grange and Farmer Education in Mississippi." He showed keen knowledge of his subject in tracing the influence which the Grange had upon farmer education in the state. The Grange's program of self-sufficiency and diversification was largely a failure. But there were important indirect accomplishments, most notable of which were the founding of Mississippi State College and Mississippi State College for Women, and the awakening of the agricultural population to the values of education.

The local history section was presided over by Dr. William D. McCain of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History. William J. Van Shreeven of the Virginia State Library presented a paper on "William Walter Hening of Virginia," in which he discussed the scholarly activities of this early compiler of Virginia laws. Professor William B. Hamilton of Duke University read a paper on "John Francis Hamtramck Claiborne of Mississippi," who was shown to be a maker as well as a user of local historical materials. Professor Hugh T. Lefler of the University of North Carolina presented a lively paper on "Samuel A'Court Ashe of North Carolina," one of the pioneers in southern local

history. All three papers were discussed by Dr. C. C. Crittenden, North Carolina Historical Commission, Dan Lacy, Works Progress Administration, and James W. Moffitt, Oklahoma Historical Society. This section was sponsored by the newly organized American Association of State and Local History, and it proved a very good addition to the Southern Historical Association program. That there was much interest in this part of the program was indicated by the lively extemporaneous discussion which followed the formal part of the session.

Concluding the annual meeting was a luncheon session on Saturday, which was devoted to "Southern Literature and Music." Unfortunately, the Program Committee did not consider the time problem when the session was planned, and it was marred somewhat by its length. Nevertheless, it was an excellent part of the program, and there was good attendance. Professor Samuel M. Selden of the Carolina Playmakers of the University of North Carolina discussed "Southern History in Pageantry." He treated pageantry historically in southern literature, but specifically described the work on Roanoke Island in producing "The Lost Colony." Professor Philip D. Jordan of Miami University read a paper and directed a program on "Musical Memories of the Old South." The historical background of the composers and the songs which were popular in the ante-bellum and Civil War South were presented. To illustrate his discussion, Professor Jordan had the services of the music director and a girls' quartet from Agnes Scott College. This was both an entertaining and edifying part of the meeting. The program was concluded with an excellent paper on "Literature of the New South," by Professor Robert Penn Warren, associate editor of the *Southern Review*, Louisiana State University. Professor Warren gave a scholarly analysis of the writers who have either lived in the New South or who have used the postwar southern scene as the setting for their writings. His was perhaps the best critical interpretation which has thus far been written concerning the flood of material about the New South which has poured from the presses since 1915.

Annual Report of the Secretary-Treasurer

BY JAMES W. PATTON

The Secretary-Treasurer is again privileged to report that the Association has experienced a successful and prosperous year. All officers have worked in harmony, and the various committees have functioned with efficiency.

Especial reference should be made to the work of Professors Philip Davidson and Ross H. McLean, cochairmen of the Local Arrangements Committee; to Professor Thomas D. Clark, chairman of the Program Committee; and to Professor Hugh T. Lefler, who generously gave his time for a second year as chairman of the Membership Committee. All of these have aided the Secretary in numerous instances throughout the year, and they amply deserve the thanks of the Association. The favorable comments upon the *Journal of Southern History* and its editor, Professor Wendell H. Stephenson, which were mentioned in my report of 1940 as having been received from various sources during that year, have continued without a single dissenting note in 1941.

As customary, the Association was invited to hold a joint session with the American Historical Association at the latter's annual meeting in Chicago, December 29-31, 1941. This session was devoted to a consideration of "The Republican Party in the South," with the papers read by Professors James W. Patton, Elliott O. Watson, and Judson C. Ward.

The finances of the Association are in a sound condition. All obligations have been promptly met, and despite an additional outlay for printing the annual index and title pages of the *Journal* and providing contributors with reprints of their respective articles, receipts for the year have exceeded expenditures by over \$1,250. Upon the government's

removal of its restriction against the purchase of United States Savings Bonds by associations, the Treasurer invested an additional \$1,480 in these securities, with the result that this Association now holds United States Bonds having a maturity value of \$9,000.

At the annual meeting of the Executive Council held in Atlanta on November 7, the resignation of Professor Wendell H. Stephenson as managing editor of the *Journal of Southern History* was accepted, and Mr. Fred C. Cole was elected to this position. Professor Stephenson was retained upon the editorial staff of the *Journal* in the capacity of editorial associate, a position held up to this time by Mr. Cole. The Treasurer was instructed to continue the practice of purchasing United States Savings Bonds with the surplus funds of the Association, as such funds become available. It was also voted that beginning January 1, 1942, the Secretary-Treasurer should receive the sum of \$300 annually as compensation for his services in connection with this office. Professors Fletcher M. Green of the University of North Carolina and Bell I. Wiley of the University of Mississippi were elected to the Board of Editors of the *Journal of Southern History* for four-year terms, 1942 to 1945 inclusive, replacing Professors Frank L. Owsley and Avery O. Craven whose terms expired with the current year. Montgomery, Alabama, was selected as the place for the 1942 annual meeting.

At the annual business session of the Association held in Atlanta on November 7, 1941, the following resolution of the Executive Council was presented by Professor Frank L. Owsley, and unanimously adopted:

Upon the occasion of the retirement of Professor Wendell H. Stephenson as managing editor of the *Journal of Southern History*, the Executive Council of the Southern Historical Association wishes to call attention to certain facts:

Under the brilliant and tactful editorship of Professor Stephenson, the *Journal of Southern History* has within the space of six years attained a distinguished position among historical journals.

Professor Stephenson's retirement has been accepted by the Council with the greatest reluctance; but his new duties as dean of the College of Arts and Sciences in Louisiana State University are so heavy that he has found it impossible to perform the duties of a managing editor. It is with pleasure, however, that it can be stated here that Professor Stephenson has consented to retain his connection with the *Journal* in the capacity of editorial associate, and thus the As-

sociation does not lose the wise and experienced counsel of our retiring editor.

Therefore, in behalf of the Southern Historical Association, the Executive Council wishes to express the deepest gratitude to Professor Stephenson for his long and arduous services as managing editor of the *Journal of Southern History*.

A resolution was presented by Professor Robert H. Woody, relative to the *Territorial Papers of the United States*, and was adopted by the Association as follows:

Whereas, the publication of the *Territorial Papers of the United States* by the Department of State under an authorization of Congress exemplifies for the first time certain significant processes in the evolution of the nation, therefore

Be it *Resolved*, by the Southern Historical Association in annual meeting assembled, that an expression of appreciation be conveyed to the Honorable the Secretary of State for having carried this publication to its present stage, and that he be urged to lay before the appropriate committees of Congress the urgent necessity of continuing the work of thus making available, at a minimum cost as in the past, these documentary materials which are viewed by this Association as essential to a better understanding of American democracy.

And be it further *Resolved* that the Secretary of this Association be directed to furnish copies of this resolution to the Honorable the Secretary of State and the Chairmen of the Appropriations Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The following officers were elected for 1942: president, Albert B. Moore, University of Alabama; vice-president, J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton, University of North Carolina; secretary-treasurer, James W. Patton, Converse College. Professors William C. Binkley of Vanderbilt University and Bernard Mayo of the University of Virginia were elected as members of the Executive Council for the term 1942 to 1944 inclusive.

MEMBERSHIP

On December 31, 1940, the Secretary reported 983 active members of the Association. Since that time 30 members have resigned, and 56 have been dropped for nonpayment of dues. Five members have been removed by death: Carl Gillette Alvord of Torrington, Connecticut; James Austin Anderson of University, Alabama; Milledge Lipscomb Bonham, Jr., professor of history in Hamilton College, Clinton, New York; Sylvester Greer, Bradford School, Dixiana, Alabama; and Robert Paine Pell, president emeritus of Converse College, Spartanburg, South

Carolina. Ninety-eight new members have been added during the year, and one previously dropped has been restored to his affiliation. This yields a net gain of 8 members for the year and a total active membership of 991. Six of these are life members. In addition to the active members, there are 67 exchange members, making a grand total of 1,058. Of the active members, however, 63 are still in arrears for 1941 dues, despite the fact that each has been sent three separate reminders.

From the above statistics it will be observed that the net increase in membership for 1941 is considerably less than that reported on previous occasions. It is entirely probable that the Association's years of extremely rapid growth are ended for a time, and that we are now entering upon a period when only modest annual gains are to be expected. This does not mean that there should be any relaxation of effort on the part of those charged with securing new members. A certain number of members always resign each year, and there inevitably comes a time when others must be dropped from the rolls for failure to heed requests for the payment of dues. Thus a constant stream of new recruits must be brought into the Association annually if we are to maintain our present standing, to say nothing of increasing our numbers. Individual members can render the Secretary a valuable service in this respect, as many have done in the past, by sending in the names of friends and acquaintances who might be interested in joining the Association.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

DECEMBER 31, 1941

Balance as of January 1, 1941:

Investments:

7 U. S. Savings Bonds @ \$750.00	\$5,250.00
Interest accrued but not collected	70.00

Total investments	\$5,320.00
Time deposit, Commercial National Bank, Spartanburg, South Carolina	1,000.00
Checking account, Commercial National Bank, Spartanburg, South Carolina	1,263.46

Total	\$ 7,583.46
-----------------	-------------

Receipts, January 1 to December 31, 1941:

Annual dues collected	\$2,559.89
Sale of extra copies, back files, and reprints, <i>Journal of Southern History</i>	212.97
Life membership	50.00
Advertising in the <i>Journal</i>	20.00
Balance from annual meeting	75.75
Interest on time deposit	20.00
Interest on Savings Bonds, accrued but not collected	140.00
	<hr/>
Total receipts	\$ 3,078.61
	<hr/>
Total to be accounted for	\$10,662.07

Disbursements, January 1 to December 31,
1941:

Printing:

February and May, 1941, issues, <i>Journal of Southern History</i>	\$1,231.20
Title pages and index, Volume VI, 1940	92.00
Authors' reprints, February, May, and August, 1941	241.30
Folders for membership committee	21.50
Programs for annual meeting	49.30
Stationery	40.30
Office supplies	17.20
Mimeographing	21.25
Bank charges	4.30
Refunds on overpaid accounts	3.75
Bad check returned	3.00
Postage:	
Membership committee	14.32
Programs for annual meeting	15.45
President and Secretary	72.05
	<hr/>
Total disbursements	\$1,826.92
	<hr/>

Balance as of December 31, 1941.. \$8,835.15

ANALYSIS OF BALANCE

Investments:

7 U. S. Savings Bonds @ \$750.00.....\$5,250.00

Interest accrued but not collected, 1940 and	
1941	210.00
2 U. S. Savings Bonds @ \$740.00	1,480.00
<hr/>	
Total investments	\$6,940.00
Time deposit, Commercial National Bank, Spartanburg, South Carolina	1,000.00
Checking account, Commercial National Bank, Spartanburg, South Carolina	895.15
<hr/>	
Total	\$8,835.15

Notes and Documents

PLOTTING AFTER HARPERS FERRY: THE "WILLIAM HANDY" LETTERS

EDITED BY JAMES C. MALIN

So assiduous have historians been in explaining John Brown on grounds of insanity that few have seemed to realize that there were plots both before and after Harpers Ferry which were fully as fantastic as that episode. The idea of abolition of slavery by revolution and the shedding of blood was by no means new when Brown tried it, and even after the example of his failure, the proposals advocated in the "William Handy" letters¹ were discussed in all seriousness by men who should have learned something from experience.

Frightened by the consequences of the Virginia raid, most of those who had been conspirators with John Brown sought safety in flight. Among them was Franklin B. Sanborn, who fled twice to Canada, on October 21, 1859, and again soon after February 16, 1860, when the Senate committee headed by James M. Mason of Virginia, engaged in investigating the raid, secured the issuance of a warrant for his arrest with a view to requiring him to testify. Upon Sanborn's return from Canada, Dunning R. McNair, the sergeant at arms of the United States Senate, through his deputy Silas Carleton, arrested him at Concord, April 3, 1860, but he "was forcibly snatched from senatorial custody" and brought before Chief Justice Lemuel Shaw of Massachusetts in Boston on a writ of habeas corpus and released the following day.² San-

¹ These letters are among papers which Thomas Wentworth Higginson deposited with the Kansas Historical Society, Topeka.

² Franklin B. Sanborn, *Recollections of Seventy Years*, 2 vols. (Boston, 1909), I, 188-89, 207, 208-17.

born concluded his own version of the story many years later by declaring: "No further effort was made to arrest me, the time and manner of my seizure having put the public opinion of Massachusetts wholly on my side."³

The situation was not so simple as Sanborn represented it, however, and it is necessary to fill in some background framework for the "William Handy" episode. Before the Mason committee was set up, Sanborn was concerned over being drawn into the Harpers Ferry trials, and after seeking legal advice, reported to Thomas W. Higginson, by a letter of November 13, 1859, that, under an act of August 8, 1846, a material witness could be arrested on a warrant from a Federal judge and required to testify in court. Intervention by writ of habeas corpus would not be possible, he wrote, unless a state judge acted on the ground that the Federal law was unconstitutional. A witness could be released, therefore, only by "a tumult." "Would your Worcester people," he asked Higginson, "go down to Boston to take Dr. [Samuel G.] Howe or Wendell Phillips out of the marshal's hands?" On November 19, after further inquiries, he wrote: "There is no hope in the courts at present; but the *people* can prevent the execution of this law." Therefore, he had determined to refuse a writ of habeas corpus, but, if arrested, he would "consent to be rescued only by force."⁴

The release of two Harpers Ferry prisoners, John E. Cook and Edwin Coppoc, was attempted unsuccessfully December 14-15, 1859. Plans were made to rescue two others, Aaron D. Stevens and Albert Hazlett, after their sentence on February 14, 1860, with Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, as a base of operations, but the project was abandoned as impracticable.⁵ The latter plot involved some of the same conspirators who figured in the "William Handy" letters—Higginson, Richard J. Hinton, and William Thayer.

The first of the "Handy" letters, that of April 3, 1860, shows the in-

³ *Ibid.*, I, 217.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 204-205.

⁵ Oswald G. Villard, *John Brown, 1800-1859: A Biography Fifty Years After* (Boston, 1910), 569-80.

ception of a new kind of plot, not to save the condemned prisoners from the gallows, but to precipitate a conflict between the state and Federal governments, or some other kind of armed conflict, the exact course of which was none too clear in "Handy's" mind. James Redpath was the central figure at this point; the Sanborn incident entered later. Higginson was invited to participate, and on April 5 he gave a favorable answer. The meetings of the conspirators were held in "Handy's" office on April 5 and 6, the object still being to use the possible arrest of Redpath as the occasion for a dramatic armed rescue, which would bring about the desired conflict. In writing on April 6, "Handy," although in Boston, appeared, or possibly pretended, not to have known of the Sanborn affair at Concord except as he had heard of it from "Reed" (Hinton), nor of the hearings before Chief Justice Shaw two days earlier which had freed Sanborn. "Handy" recognized the new possibilities inherent in the arrest of Sanborn, however, and concluded that "it is immaterial *how* the contest comes, so long as it *does* come between our state and the general government." According to this letter, Sanborn had given assurance on April 5 through "Reed" that he would "forward a list" of men who would "defend him with powder & ball."

The statements in the letter of April 6 concerning the Sanborn affair do not seem to conform with the record of telegrams for April 4. From Boston on the day of the Sanborn hearing, "Handy" wired Higginson at Worcester: "Please come here quickly as possible. I will explain." Higginson was in Concord, however, and he wired his wife: "At Concord. Home Thursday afternoon. Trouble all over."

By April 16 the arrest of both Redpath and Sanborn was anticipated. Higginson was notified to be in readiness with "old lectures or sermons," the code words for men, just as "machines" or "miners" had been the code words in the Harrisburg plot in February. Referring to April 19, the anniversary of the Battle of Lexington, which opened the American Revolution, "Handy" queried, "Who knows but that Thursday next 19th shall initiate another step in the grand revolution to come?"

The "William Handy" of this correspondence was William Thayer of the Boston publishing house of Thayer and Eldridge. The letter of

April 3 contained a postscript advising that replies be directed in care of that firm; and on April 6 two letters were written to Higginson by the same hand, one signed "Handy" and the other "Thayer & Eldridge."⁶ The one signed with the company name was a request for a testimonial letter endorsing James Redpath's new book, *Echoes of Harpers Ferry*, to be published by the firm in a few days; it requested about ten sentences "giving the character of John Brown from a moral or religious point of view." Higginson complied, but Redpath wrote him on April 20:

Yr sentences arrived too late & they were not exactly what I wanted. The book will be out Wednesday [April 25]. I shall stay at Home & fire at the first intrusion on my premisses. I have thought the whole matter carefully over & believe that this course will be best & most effective in advancing the cause. That the body of a U. S. Marshal is not impervious to a bullet well directed, is a lesson which I think now needs to be demonstrated—and the times are ripe for it. If Heaven, then, sees fit to depute me to teach it, I shall bow and obey.⁷

Having identified "Handy" as the publisher of two of Redpath's books on John Brown⁸ issued within four months' time, and considering that fact in conjunction with the request for a testimonial letter from Higginson, the thought occurs that possibly Thayer's interest in the rescue plot was not so much in promotion of a revolution as of sensational advertising. Thayer, however, had been one of the Harrisburg conspirators and was already more deeply committed than would have been necessary for an advertising stunt, although he was probably not unaware of the publicity value of Redpath's being the object of such a rescue as he was planning.

More conservative men such as Henry Wilson (Republican) and Amos A. Lawrence (Know-Nothing) had taken the position early in the Kansas controversy that any action in behalf of the Negro slave must be so conducted as to identify the antislavery cause with the national idea, patriotism, and defense of the Union, and to identify the

⁶ Before sending the correspondence to the Kansas Historical Society, Higginson penciled "Thayer" under the Handy signature but did not give further identification.

⁷ James Redpath to Higginson, April 20, 1859, in Higginson Papers.

⁸ The other book by Redpath published by Thayer and Eldridge was *The Public Life of Capt. John Brown* (Boston, 1860).

slavery cause with state rights, disloyalty, and dissolution of the Union.⁹ The radical abolitionists made no such nice distinctions, and, as is demonstrated clearly in the "Handy" letters, they identified abolition with state rights and revolution. This was not a position unique to this episode, but was in keeping with the plotting of that group from the time the Kansas agitation opened—that is, so long as the Democrats were in power at Washington. For the historian to dispose of John Brown of Harpers Ferry by the insanity device is as futile as it was for Virginia to hang him, and demonstrates as complete a failure to understand the significance of the culmination of the abolition movement as broader than any one man or episode. They proposed to precipitate revolution by whatever means presented itself; but it is pathetically clear that they did not know what was to be the course of events or the final objective once the torch of revolution was lighted. Whatever the defects of the more conservative Republican party leaders, they succeeded in keeping their advocacy of antislavery identified with the national idea, and when the Civil War, with its accompanying revolution, did come, they became "patriots," while the advocates of state rights and slavery became "rebels." Historians have too charitably slurred over the misrepresentations, the inconsistencies, and the contradictions by which the radical abolitionists rationalized themselves into the national camp after the event. Indeed, the radical abolitionists had nationalism and patriotism thrust upon them by the course of events, and in spite of their own earnest efforts to make themselves rebels and traitors.

Boston April 3/60

Dear Sir.

Mr Redpath has got home from the West. In case of arrest by U. S. authorities he will place himself under jurisdiction of our State court and thoroughly exhaust all legal tests of power between the General and State Gov'ts and then he *wont* go to Washington—provided that at the outset a body of friends will help him personally if the decision goes against him.

Now we propose if his case is tried in Boston, to have in the court room

⁹ Henry Wilson to the Northern Disunion Convention, Worcester, Massachusetts, in *New York Tribune*, January 17, 1857, and *Washington National Era*, January 29, 1857; Amos A. Lawrence to James B. Abbott, February 22, 1856, in *Abbott Papers* (Kansas Historical Society).

during the trial 25 men *well armed* under a competent leader. If the judge decrees that he must go to Washⁿ. we will encircle and defend him against the Sergeant or U. S. Marshall

You will at once perceive the great results to flow from the collision between State courts and the United States or between James Redpath with twenty five well armed men and both courts united

Boston is a grand field. Will you correspond on this subject? Will you be interested to the extent of finding some men who will pledge their presence? The arrest may not take place; but it is well to be prepared.

If our L[eague] of F[reedom?] had been under thorough organization, how easily we might have effected a rescue of Horner at Phil^a. Let us be prepared for another if necessary.

Yours for freedom
W^m. Handy

P. S.

direct to Care of Thayer & Eldridge.

Boston April 6/60.

My Dear Sir.

Your *good* letter of 5th rec'd this A M.—

The *boys* met yesterday at our office & to night are to have another meeting to decide upon some plan. None but *fighters* are eligible. We are now fourteen in number who are willing to shoot or be shot at at five minutes notice in the caus of the United States vs. Sanborn or Redpath or any other man who represents a principle of right—liberty.

Now will the "conservative" Concord men *fight*? Reed saw Sanborn at Concord yesterday P. M. The latter promises to forward a list of the men who will defend him with powder & ball. We, here, will work at organization, for after all, this is the grand question to be answered by every man,—fight or no fight.— I think it dangerous to rely on any courts, or legal processes at the present time. The question is this:—are *you*, am *I* prepared to march at short notice to resist an unjust, mean, barbarous, mandate imposed upon a fellow citizen by the slave power of the Southern States?

In view of this let us be prepared to fight.

Redpath now intends to remain at Malden.

A subscription paper has been opened to buy a beautifully mounted pistol—cost say \$75.—to present to Miss Sanborn for her bravery in defending her brother.— Redpath suggests that there be engraved upon the barrel "The straight and narrow path to heaven", L. B. has the matter in charge & will probably accept the proposal. The amount has nearly all been raised.—

Reed says that Sanborn has been arrested by the Concord people for some

misdemeanor (?) so that he is holden by Sheriff Moore till June. I could not get an exact statement of the affair, but it is immaterial *how* the contest comes, so long as it *does* come between our state and the general government.

Will keep you advised of plans if any of importance are made.

Yours Truly
Handy

LETTERS OF FRANCIS KINLOCH TO THOMAS BOONE
1782-1788

EDITED BY FELIX GILBERT

The person to whom the letters printed below were addressed is well known to the historian. Thomas Boone (1730-1812) was governor of South Carolina from 1761 to 1764, and, during his period of office, the famous conflict between the Governor and the legislative assembly took place which greatly increased the irritation of the colonies against the mother country. In the course of this conflict Boone was recalled to England, and he spent his later life in London, as Commissioner of the Customs House.¹ The writer of these letters is less easily identified. Francis Kinloch (1755-1826) was a captain in the American army during a part of the War of Independence; he was wounded at Savannah and taken a prisoner at Charleston. Later, in 1780, he became a member of the Continental Congress. Thus his name can be found in the *Historical Register of Officers of the Continental Army*,² as well as in the *Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1927*.³ Furthermore, as a wealthy plantation owner and member of South Carolina's ruling class he had a share in the politics of his home state. He served in the House of Representatives in 1779 and 1786-1788, in the state convention which ratified the Federal Constitution in 1788, and in the state constitutional convention of 1790. Yet the part that he played in these political assemblies was never conspicuous, and his name is no

¹ On Boone see the recent article by Lewis B. Namier, "Charles Garth and his Connections," in *English Historical Review* (London, 1886-), LIV (1939), 462-70.

² Francis B. Heitman (ed.), (Washington, 1914).

³ Washington, 1928.

longer given in currently published biographical cyclopedias.⁴ Evidently his political gifts and ambitions were not very great. His true interests lay in the world of art and literature, and here he has left two works: *Eulogy on George Washington . . .*,⁵ and two volumes of *Letters from Geneva and France*.⁶ The latter is a work of definite charm and is full of interesting information, although a verbose style and lengthy discussions of a purely didactic character make the reading sometimes difficult.

His literary interests grew, as Kinloch emphasizes repeatedly, out of his friendship with Johannes von Müller, the famous Swiss historian, one of the great figures of Europe's intellectual life in the Napoleonic age.⁷ Like so many young Southerners of his class, Kinloch had been to school in England, at Eton. Later he was sent to Geneva in order to complete his education. There, in 1774, at the home of the philosopher Charles Bonnet, Kinloch and Müller met. The twenty-two-year-old Müller became the tutor and soon the friend of the young American.⁸ While Kinloch owed to Müller his initiation into the world of literature, Müller acquired through this friendship an intense interest in the American scene. This interest lasted throughout Müller's entire life. Its

⁴ His life is described in *Appleton's Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, 7 vols. (New York, 1887-1900), III, 550, and very briefly (the name given as Kinlock) in *Harper's Encyclopaedia of United States History*, 10 vols. (New York, 1905), V, 258, but there is no article on Francis Kinloch in Allen Johnson and Dumas Malone (eds.), *Dictionary of American Biography*, 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937). See, however, Anne King Gregorie, "Cleland Kinloch," *ibid.*, X, 414. This article on Francis's brother contains valuable data on the history of the Kinloch family. The various articles on Francis Kinloch are not very exact, and the information in them has been used only in so far as it is corroborated by manuscript materials in the editor's possession.

⁵ First published in Georgetown, South Carolina, in 1800, the *Eulogy* was reprinted in New York in 1867.

⁶ These letters were first published in the periodical *Port Folio* (Philadelphia, 1801-1827), Ser. II, Vols. V-VI (1808), and Ser. III, Vols. I-III (1809-1810), and later in book form (Boston, 1819). The full title is *Letters from Geneva and France, written during a residence of between two and three years, and addressed to a lady in Virginia. By the father*. The "addressed" lady is Kinloch's daughter Eliza (Kinloch) Nelson. See ns. 37 and 52, below.

⁷ The latest study on Müller, containing a complete bibliography, is that by P. Herzog, *Johannes von Müller und die französische Literatur*, in *Zürcher Schriften zur Literaturwissenschaft*, XXX (Leipzig, 1937). The standard biography is that by Karl Henking, *Johannes von Müller*, 2 vols. (Stuttgart, 1909-1928); unfortunately it has never been completed.

⁸ On Müller's friendship with Kinloch, see Henking, *Johannes von Müller*, I, 181-201.

first literary reflection can be seen in the "Lectures on Universal History" which Müller gave in Geneva in 1779-1780 and which culminated in an historical evaluation of the American Revolution. Among the audience was young Albert Gallatin, who, in the same year, departed from Geneva and set out for his career in the New World.⁹ Kinloch left Switzerland in 1776, but he and Müller maintained their contact by a correspondence which was ended only by Müller's death in 1809.

It was due to this friendship with Müller that Kinloch's letters to Boone were preserved. For they are among Müller's papers in the Stadtbibliothek of Schaffhausen—papers which contain 120 letters of Kinloch to Müller in addition to 6 letters to Boone.¹⁰ Thomas Boone had been Kinloch's guardian and as such took charge of his education. Boone seems to have been favorably impressed by what Kinloch told him of Müller, and he entered into direct correspondence with the Swiss historian.¹¹ In the course of this correspondence, Boone informed Müller whenever he had news from America, and he sent him copies or the originals of the letters which he received from Kinloch. In this way the letters came into Müller's papers.

While in general needed explanations are given in the footnotes, it might be noted here that in his letters to Boone, Kinloch's political interests and activities obtrude less than in his letters to Müller. Probably he did not want to hurt the feelings of Boone, who was a declared enemy of America. Kinloch may even have had some misgivings about his political position in view of the fact that when he had last seen Boone in England, in 1777-1778, he himself had been more than hesitant to take sides against England. Moreover, the personality of his guardian seems to have exercised a somewhat restraining and dampen-

⁹ He took with him a letter of introduction to Kinloch. See Henry Adams, *The Life of Albert Gallatin* (Philadelphia, 1880), 24.

¹⁰ These 120 letters of Kinloch to Müller, written between 1776 and 1809, are very interesting, and I hope to be able to publish them. Their value would be considerably increased if Müller's replies to Kinloch's letters could be found, and I shall be very grateful for any information on the whereabouts of Kinloch's papers. Albert B. Faust, *Guide to the Materials for American History in Swiss and Austrian Archives* (Washington, 1916), does not mention these letters.

¹¹ Selections of Müller's correspondence with Boone are published in Johannes von Müller, *Sämmtliche Werke*, 40 vols. (Stuttgart, 1831-1835), XXXVIII.

ing influence on Kinloch; his letters to Boone lack the freshness and vivacity which characterize those addressed directly to Müller. The letters to Boone are valuable, however, for historical reasons. Writing to one who had been in America for many years, Kinloch was able not only to survey the general development of the United States in the crucial time in which he was writing but also to give many details that Boone could appreciate. Furthermore, both Kinloch and Boone were typical of important political groups, one of the southern plantation aristocracy, the other of the Loyalists. Thus the correspondence exhibits the point of view from which these groups looked upon the beginnings of American political life.

Albemarle County at the foot of the
S. West Mountains Virginia

Oct 1' 1782¹²

Amongst the various ill consequences of this unhappy War, You will, I trust, my ever dear, my best of Friends, do me the justice to believe, that I lament particularly every circumstance, that has prevented my writing to yourself, & to Muller, as frequently, & in the stile, & manner I could wish; it is easy indeed to avoid politics, but a Letter, falling into the hands of Friends, or Foes, may be so canvassed, & every expression so tortured from it's meaning, that a Man may be made to speak treason, who is only making enquiries after his Friend's health, or giving him an Account of his situation in Life. With My L[etter] to you by Mr. Laurens,¹³ which I find you received, went a very long one to Muller; I am afraid it never reached him; be so kind as to inform him of this, when you write & to add, that as I am convinced he has written to me frequently, though I never received a Line, so I hope he will rest assured, that I have not neglected him, and will attribute my silence to the Miscarriage of my Letters. I must cease to Live, ere I cease to think of you as of a Parent, & of Muller as of a Brother; as to my other Friends, Mess. G & L., to whom I have also many obligations, they will, I am convinced, if they reflect a moment on the circumstances of the times, when I got home,¹⁴ acquit me of all intentional delay in making them remittances. There was no crop made the year of my arrival, owing to a very severe hurricane, I reaped no benefit from that of the

¹² This letter is in a copyist's hand.

¹³ This was probably John Laurens, who had sailed for France in February, 1781; he had been a friend and fellow student of Kinloch at Geneva. See the brief biography of John Laurens, in David D. Wallace, *The Life of Henry Laurens* (New York, 1915), 474-75.

¹⁴ Kinloch had sailed from England to America in April, 1778.

succeeding year, & have been since that time as effectually debarred the Enjoyment of my property,¹⁶ as if it lay in the East-Indies.

I was never a predestinarian, but every day now serves to convince me, that there is a regular course of great events prepared by Providence, which Men blindly contribute to the bringing about of, though with views diametrically contrary; You will agree with me in opinion, if you consider the conduct of the British Commander, & Officers in South Carolina, who with every wish, (I may safely do them that justice) of promoting the entire reduction of the Country, have done every thing, that could keep it ours.¹⁶ The ruling power of the State had perhaps behaved with severity to non-conformists, but the excuse which Dido makes Aeneas,¹⁷ might be alledged in their favour; it was not however, at all events, good policy to imbibe the resentment of a few persecuted Loyalists; the horror of war should have been softened, & the returning beams of Royal Government would have gladdened the heart of many a now determined foe; Numbers would by degrees have slid into the situation of British Subjects, I speak of those, who were taken in Charles Town, or at least have so far availed themselves of the protection the British Government afforded, as to be considered with a jealous Eye by their fellow Citizens in Arms; but when an Oath was tendered, & every Man called upon to make a public recantation,¹⁸ & that too at a time, when the force on either side was nearly equal, there was not a Moment's hesitation in the choice between present possession, & security, attended with disgrace, on the one hand, & honourable Poverty, with every hope of revenge, & retaliation, on the other. I will not expatiate upon the excesses of the British Army; it would be a disagreeable subject to you, & a very melancholy one to me, suffice it to say, that, exclusive of the brutality of the Soldiery, which, I know cannot at all times be restrained, such scenes have been perpetrated by Officers whom I could Name, & whose families are amongst the first

¹⁶ Kinloch's father had died in 1767 and had left his children the plantations "New Gilmerton," "Wehaw," "Kensington," and "Rice Hope" in South Carolina. They were partitioned among them in 1784, and then Francis Kinloch's main residence became "Kensington" in Georgetown District, South Carolina.

¹⁶ On the events in South Carolina discussed in this letter, cf. David Ramsay, *Ramsay's History of South Carolina* . . . , 2 vols. in one (Newberry, S. C., 1858), I, 223-24; and Edward McCrady, *History of South Carolina in the Revolution, 1775-1780* (New York, 1901), *passim*, especially Chap. XXV, which deals with the behavior of the English troops and the attitude of the alternating American and Loyalist governments toward the population.

¹⁷ *Aeneid*, IV, 433: "Tempus inane peto, requiem spatiumque furori."

¹⁸ This is an allusion to the proclamation of Sir Henry Clinton, June 3, 1780, which demanded explicit return to the English allegiance and a due submission to His Majesty's government. As to its crucial importance for the revolutionary history of South Carolina, see McCrady, *History of South Carolina in the Revolution, 1775-1780*, p. 554, where it is said that "This proclamation was the point upon which the continuance of the Revolution in South Carolina turned."

in Great Britain, as would make you, and every worthy Englishman blush for the degeneracy of the Nation. The consequence of such bad policy, & of such conduct has been, that South Carolina is again in the hands of the Americans, & that there is not a British Soldier in Arms off Charles Town Neck. A superior Force may again penetrate into the Country, but the result must in the end be the same, for however unequal the contest may seem to those at a distance, they should recollect, that there is scarce an Instance in History, where a whole People have been united in defence of one common cause, who have not been ultimately Victorious. It seems however, to have been an Idea entertained in England, that a great body of the Inhabitants were desirous of a reunion, of the inhabitants of America, I should have said; that there are many who regret, that we should have quarrelled, & who curse the causes of it, I most firmly believe, but we have been foes too long to be ever on the former footing, & you will easily conceive, that those, who have risen to distinction in the Civil, or military, are not fond of the Idea; the rising generation too have imbibed prejudices, that render such an event utterly impossible, the lower sort of People, who were in many parts, particularly in South Carolina, originally attached to the British Government, have suffered so severely, & been so frequently deceived, that Great Britain has now a hundred enemies, where it had one before. Your good Opinion of me, which, I flatter myself, I have not forfeited, will lead you, I trust, to pay some degree of attention to the representation I have given of the State of affairs, & when you recollect my attachment to England, my admiration of the English Government, & the circumstance of my having passed the happier Years of my Life under Your protection, You will be convinced that I neither exaggerate, nor misrepresent. I have led for this last Year a private Life¹⁹ in a part of Virginia, which in point of situation, & healthfulness, puts me daily in mind of Switzerland, a Country I remember with the more satisfaction, as I there imbibed that taste for Litterature, which would render any retreat agreeable. Retired as I was in the bosom of a Family, that have adopted me,²⁰ the British found me out, & I was unexpectedly made prisoner by Cap. Kinloch of the Gil-

¹⁹ Kinloch had been elected a member of the Continental Congress for South Carolina in February, 1780, and attended its meetings from March to November, 1780. He was elected again in October, 1781, but attended the Congress neither in 1781 nor in 1782. Cf. Edmund C. Burnett (ed.), *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress*, 8 vols. (Washington, 1921-1936), V, lxiii; VI, lii.

²⁰ On February 22, 1781, Kinloch had married Mildred Walker, the granddaughter of Thomas Walker, well known as a physician, explorer, and guardian of Jefferson, and the daughter of Colonel John Walker, proprietor of the Belvoir estate in Albemarle County, Virginia. Kinloch lived on the estate of his father-in-law. Cf. [Richard C. M. Page], *Genealogy of the Page Family in Virginia* (New York, 1883), 206; and Edward C. Mead, *Historic Homes of the South-West Mountains, Virginia* (Philadelphia, 1899), 166-67.

merton Family.²¹ Nothing however can exceed the good treatment I experienced; they detained me but a few Days, & I am now altogether free in consequence of the general exchange. My Mother²² is with us, but my Sister²³ & Brother²⁴ are in Charles Town,—and in this Instance I experience as feelingly as in any other the dismal consequences of this infernal War. A little Nephew of mine, my Sister's only child,²⁵ is I believe, long ère this in England; The Gentleman under whose care he went, was to make a point of introducing him to You, & I cannot but flatter myself, so far, at times, as to hope that you will not altogether refuse him Your protection—to ask more I dare not. Our Family have suffered in the common distress, but they also met with more than one Friend amongst the British Officers—Cleland's arrival was however very seasonable.

I must now take my leave of you, my Dear Sir; uncertain as I am whether this Letter will ever reach You, or whose hands it may fall into, I defer saying a great deal—You remember the motto's I had taken, the one I have laid by—the other, in opposition to . . . [?] I still keep. I had almost omitted mentioning an affair of some Consequence—A Letter I the other day received from my good Friend of Gilmerton,²⁶ whom I can never forget,—informed me, that at the Death of a Lady, who is far advanced in Life, a House in Port Glastow would revert to me as next heir by the Laws of Scotland, but I have not as yet had it in my power to find Persons who could Witness a power of Attorney—be

²¹ Kinloch's grandfather James Kinloch, who had come to America in 1703, was a son of Sir Francis Kinloch of Gilmerton, Scotland, and the two branches of the family had remained in some contact. Cf. n. 26, below. The episode alluded to in Kinloch's letter took place on June 4, 1781, during Tarleton's raid on Charlottesville. Tarleton's soldiers had stopped at Castle Hill, the estate of Thomas Walker, for breakfast, and they were delayed there until Jefferson was warned and could escape. Among the American rebels surprised by Tarleton at Castle Hill "were William and Robert, brothers of Gov. Thomas Nelson, of Yorktown, Virginia, and Francis Kinloch. In their attempt to escape, the latter was pursued into the vineyard field by a British soldier, who shouted, 'Stop, cousin Frank; you know I could always beat you running.' Whereupon the cousin Frank surrendered." [Page], *Genealogy of the Page Family*, 196.

²² Anne (Cleland) Kinloch, daughter of John and Mary Cleland. See Henry A. M. Smith, "Georgetown—the Original Plan and the Earliest Settlers," in *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (Charleston, 1900-), IX (1908), 94.

²³ Mary Esther (Kinloch) Huger, second wife of Major Benjamin Huger, in whose house Lafayette spent his first days in America. Major Huger died before Charleston in 1779.

²⁴ Cleland Kinloch, who became a well-known rice planter. See Gregorie, "Cleland Kinloch," in *Dictionary of American Biography*, X, 414.

²⁵ Francis Kinloch Huger (1773-1855), physician and soldier, was best known because of his share in Lafayette's attempt to escape from Olmütz. See John G. Van Deusen, "Francis Kinloch Huger," *ibid.*, IX, 344; and Thomas T. Wells, *Les Huger de la Caroline du Sud; La Fayette à Olmütz* (Paris, 1931).

²⁶ Sir David Kinloch of Gilmerton, Fifth Baronet (died 1795). Francis Kinloch lived on his estate in Scotland in 1778, while waiting to sail for America.

so kind, my Dear Sir, as to inform Sir David of this by Letter (for mine to him may miscarry) and to assure him of my eternal Gratitude for all his Goodness. Assure Mrs. Boone²⁷ of my constant Love, and Esteem, & be persuaded that she, Yourself, and the Family have my best Wishes for Your Health & Happiness.

My Best of Friends.

My best Compliments attend Your Brothers²⁸ Family.

The enclosed has been written some time, as You will perceive by the date, My Dear Sir, I could add a thousand things, but the chance of this Letter's ever reaching You, & the inspection it must undergo, cramps my Pen, Tho' you do not hear from Me, be persuaded that I write—Col. Laurens had with Your's a very long, & confidential Letter to Muller—I have written since—My Love to Mrs. Boone, & to the rest of the Family—How happy it would make me to see you all—if any opportunity offers that you can trust to,—Pray send my Snuff Box.²⁹

Adieu my best of Friends.

Albemarle County Virginia

27. June 1783.³⁰

My dear Sir,

Your letter of February 4th from London never came to hand, but the Copy of Feb. 18th which alludes to it, has reached me; do not think I exaggerate if I assure You, that the loss of my own estate could not have affected me more than the loss of yours does, for lost it is beyond all hopes.³¹ My Brother and I pre-

²⁷ Mrs. Boone was a South Carolinian, Sarah Ann, daughter of Thomas Tattnall and widow of Samuel Peronneau. Namier, "Charles Garth and his Connexions," in *loc. cit.*, 462.

²⁸ Boone had two brothers, Daniel and Charles, who were both members of Parliament for many years. *Ibid.*, 458-70.

²⁹ The letter is accompanied by the following note of Boone to Müller, March 3, 1783: "The above is a Copy of a letter from Kinloch in his postscript in 1782. He says he wrote you a long letter; this is the first I have received from him for near two Years. He is now in Carolina with his Wife whom he married in Virginia. I understand, that notwithstanding the Part he has taken, he is not well with his Countrymen. But he has saved his Estate. The Americans have Confiscated mine. I had not known where to direct to you, but for the accident of meeting a Mr. Beaupin on Board a sailboat as I was returning from Caen in Normandy after placing My Son in the Academy there. I wrote to you à la poste restante à Berlin 18 months ago. If you choose to write to Kinloch, I will Convey Your letters. My best Wishes & Respects wait upon you. . . ."

³⁰ This letter is in a copyist's hand.

³¹ In February, 1782, the legislature of South Carolina, assembled in Jacksonborough, had voted the Confiscation Act, by which the estates of avowed Tories were confiscated, and among those mentioned in the act were Boone and the heirs of Mrs. Colleton. See Yates Snowden (ed.), *History of South Carolina*, 5 vols. (Chicago, 1920), I, 450-58. Thomas Boone's estates were the Pon-Pon estate, "6815 acres, forming three 'well-cultivated plantations of rice,'" and the Mepshoo estate, 2,000 acres, which he had inherited

sented a petition in which we ventured to argue more than Petitioners usually do, and we pressed our acquaintances, who were in either House, not to let the most ungenerous prejudices get the better of the first principles of justice—but all was in vain, we might as well have addressed the elements—the people at large wanton in the first exercise of sovereign power, and feel the same cruel joy in robbing the helpless families of those whom they can oppress with impunity, that an infant does in torturing an insect that falls within it's reach. The article of the preliminary Treaty, which you allude to, makes it indeed necessary that Congress should recommend restitution to the different States,³² but the recommendations of Congress are more like the pastoral Letters of a Bishop, than anything else I can think of, and I will leave you to judge, how little probability there is of any attention being paid to a recommendation which treats of restitution, when I inform you,—that the most reasonable requests which the Representatives of any nation ever made, have been refused by a Majority of the States though the consequences are, that our army must remain ripe for mutiny, and our foreign domestic debts unliquidated.³³

It has surely been the will of Providence, that Great Britain should suffer by the ignorance and wretched politics of Her Negotiators and Generals. For a more than common degree of infatuation seems to have led Cornwallis to York, and have rendered Mr. Oswald satisfied with an Article, which our Commissioners, I am well informed, told him was altogether nugatory. Your poor Negroes and many of those belonging to Mr. Colleton's³⁴ estate would have been irrecoverably lost, even had the State of South Carolina relented; for having been embarked on board of British Vessels in Charles Town and being taken by American Privateers, they were immediately condemned as lawful Prize by the Courts of Admiralty of the Ports they were carried to.³⁵ My Brother who will forward

from Mrs. Margaret Colleton (died 1779). Boone's attempts to get possession of his estates again were not successful; from the British government he received as compensation £22,533 8s., after having claimed £41,207 4s. 4d. Namier, "Charles Garth and his Connexions," in *loc. cit.*, 470.

³² He refers to Art. V of the Provisional Peace Treaty with Great Britain of November 30, 1782.

³³ He is probably referring to the fact that in 1783 the legislature of South Carolina had withdrawn "the support of South Carolina from the congressional act levying a tax of 5 per cent on imports and prizes for the support of the general government." At the same session a controversy between the assembly and General Nathanael Greene had arisen on the support of the army. Snowden (ed.), *History of South Carolina*, I, 477 ff.

³⁴ Besides the Mepshoo estate, which Boone had inherited, Mrs. Margaret Colleton possessed the Wadboo barony, which she left to James Nassau Colleton. His name was later taken off the confiscation list, but he was amerced 12 per cent. See *ibid.*, I, 457; and H. A. Smith, "The Colleton-Family in South Carolina," in *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, I (1900), 332-33.

³⁵ The main facts on the treatment of the Negro slaves during the war and on the discussion of the slavery interests in the peace negotiations may be found in Frederick A.

this from Carolina may be able to inform you of some particulars with respect to your Estate, and that of the Colleton's which I am ignorant of, for there was some small chance when I came away, that the small portion which was unsold would remain so—this however relates only to you—the Colleton family have fewer Friends than I could have imagined.

My Brother remains in Carolina, whilst I, who have a Family, have retreated before the Fever and ague to this part of the world, which is equal in soil and climate to any thing in England. I live with my Father in Law, a Gentleman whose Name is Walker,³⁶ but have a small Farm about two Miles from the Mountains which I cultivate myself. My Wife is about seventeen Years of Age, and prettier than I had any right to expect, and I have a little daughter³⁷ with black eyes and black hair, who receives me with open arms and smiling looks at the door, when I return from my Farm. My love of reading has not deserted me, I still continue reading every thing Historical and Political I can meet with, and go over the Classics at least once a Year. A Station in Public Life such as I could consent to fill, was to be supported by arts, which I am, and ever wish to remain ignorant of, and the violent spirit of injustice which prevails in councils has effectually discouraged me from being ever a member of Assembly, as I should only have the misfortune of resisting it in vain. With respect to my present situation, I shall probably pass a great deal of my time here for two or three years to come, when the payment of my Debts will enable me to live where I please—your mentioning Tom³⁸ as an Ensign in the Army makes me feel very old, for well do I remember, bearing him in my arms.

If the whole Family does me justice, they will believe, that they have not in the world a more sincere well wisher—I wish to God it may ever be in my power to prove how much I love them all,—let me beg that you would accept the standish you speak of, as a proof of my love—pray have engraved upon it that it was given by Lord North to me,³⁹ and by me to you,—and leave it by your Will to my eldest Son, or to my Brother's if I die without any. The Snuff Box and Prints I could wish sent, & my letters if it is possible to get them from Scotland, where they are under Sir David's⁴⁰ care; I have written to him, but my letter may miscarry,—I wrote to Mueller two days ago. I have but one favor to beg of you which is, that you would send me your Picture and Mrs. Boones of the size of Family Pictures—as I do not know when we shall meet

Ogg, "Jay's Treaty and the Slavery Interests of the United States," in *American Historical Association, Annual Report*, 1901, 2 vols. (Washington, 1902), I, 275-76.

³⁶ See n. 20, above.

³⁷ Eliza Kinloch, born December 31, 1781, who later married Hugh Nelson, Virginia jurist and diplomat. See [Page], *Genealogy of the Page Family*, 162; and Maude H. Woodfin, "Hugh Nelson," in *Dictionary of American Biography*, XIII, 416-17.

³⁸ Thomas Boone's only son, who died in 1799.

³⁹ Kinloch was intimate with the family of Lord North, since, while at school in England, he had saved the life of one of Lord North's sons.

⁴⁰ See n. 26, above.

again, such a present would be inestimable. Adieu, my dearest, best of friends be assured, and assure Mrs. Boone, that my Wife loves you both, as she should the best friends of her husband, I beg my best respects to your Brother and to his Family. Adieu with every degree of gratitude & affection

Your's

F. Kinloch

Albemarle County, Virginia

Sept. 1st 1783.⁴¹

My best of Friends

I wish, since we are now blessed with peace, that my Letters may reach you with any degree of regularity, for I wish, though it is unfortunately out of my power to render you any services in America, that you should be convinced of my unalterable gratitude and affection.

My letters and those of my Brother, have already, I make no doubt, convinced you, that our fears are realized, & that there is no prospect of recovering your property, which has been so unjustly taken from you. It would demand more time than I would willingly bestow on so disagreeable a Subject to attempt describing the torrents of illiberal party rage, which has borne down every thing before it in Carolina. It is not the determined resolution of Men bearing up against the calamities of War, this spirit has fled, and given way to a passion which I can compare to nothing but to that, which animates a child to torment some helpless insect, that falls within its reach. Though I served my Country in any shape they thought proper, yet I meet with too much ingratitude, and ill usage, not to determine never again to be concerned in public affairs. This resolution, joined to the necessity of appropriating as much of my income as possible to the payment of my debts, has made me determine to remain in my Wife's family until next October twelvemonth, after which time I shall, in all probability, settle in Carolina. Books, Agriculture, and my little daughter, who just begins to speak, fill up my time very agreeably, and I want nothing here but more, and more enlightened society. My Brother has taken upon him to be the active man of the Family, and is taking care of my estate, and of his own, with a great deal of Zeal; I wish his Zeal may not bring down the fever and ague upon him. I should be exceedingly glad to hear some times from you, and to be convinced that I am considered in your House as one who is, in some measure, of the Family; it will be my pleasure, and I shall consider it as my duty, to write to you frequently.

The Politics of America must no doubt engage some attention on the other side of the Atlantic, and I can assure you, that a proper history of the late War would as far as I am acquainted with the events of it, and can presume to judge, be a most interesting performance. You would there read of events following causes the least likely to have produced them, and would be amazed, not only at

⁴¹ This letter is in a copyist's hand.

sudden, and I may say, unprecedented turns of fate, but to see a chain of circumstances taking place towards the establishment of our independence, without the means of promoting it on one side, or any well judged efforts to prevent it on the other.

I shall like for many reasons to read the British account, and that I might form some idea of Cornwallis's reason for suffering himself to be shut up by an army every way inferior in York, and of Stuarts, for fighting General Greene with equal numbers at the Eutaws, where by a little exertion he could so easily have outnumbered him; these observations I have heard from Greene himself, and from almost every Man of sense I am acquainted with. It certainly was the decree of fate that America should be independent; all I have to lament is, that so great an event should have been so ruinous to the best friend I have in the world. I wish we in Carolina may make good use of our newly acquired sovereignty, but I much doubt it, and am much afraid, that our civil dissensions, and they are natural, you know, to our form of government, will end in blood, the precedent of proceeding by bill of attainder at Jacksonborough⁴² will fall heavy upon the head of some; if not, there is no faith to be put in history.

Let me request that you would write to Muller, and inform him, that I have received his little book: *Sur les voyages de Papes*.⁴³ I have answered him by the way of Philadelphia, and will write to him soon again—assure him of my unalterable esteem—I mentioned in my Letter to him that when ever Europe used him ill, my house was open to him, but if son altesse⁴⁴ pays him well, he is better off. I wish—and told him so, that Monsieur & Mad. Bonnet⁴⁵ knew that I remember them with every degree of Gratitude. Pray assure Mrs. Boone that I love her as a Parent, and her Children as my Brothers & Sisters. Adieu, dear Sir, that God may shower down his most choice blessings on You and Your Family, is the wish of Your ever Grateful, ever affectionate—

F. Kinloch

My best wishes attend your Brother, Pray make my Compliments to him.

Charleston March 14th 1786⁴⁶

I thank you much, my dear & ever honoured friend, for your last, enclosing one from Muller, & hope that Mrs. Boone's health is long ère this reestablished, without your having been under the necessity of trying what a effect a change of

⁴² He refers to the Confiscation Act. See n. 31, above.

⁴³ Müller's famous essay *Die Reisen der Päpste* had been published in 1782, first in German, then in French.

⁴⁴ Landgrave Frederick of Hesse, at whose "Collegium Carolinum," at Cassel, Müller had been professor of history since 1781. When Kinloch wrote this letter Müller had left Cassel and settled again in Geneva.

⁴⁵ Charles Bonnet (1720-1793) was a well-known Swiss natural scientist and philosopher. At his house in Genthod, near Geneva, Müller had first met Kinloch, "le vertueux Américain," as he was called by Bonnet. See Henking, *Johannes von Müller*, I, 187.

⁴⁶ This letter is in Kinloch's hand.

climate would have. Whenever I begin a letter to you, my faculties of writing seem obstructed by a sense of the injuries you have received from my countrymen; this hangs heavy at my heart, & checks every effusion which I used formerly to indulge in with so much pleasure. You will have heard of my second marriage,⁴⁷ & will naturally have accounted for my not following Your's & Muller's advice with respect to a voyage to Europe. I was once on the point of embarking, & was certain of being able to pass some years with infinite satisfaction, but when I looked forward to the time of returning here, when I figured to myself the miseries of that lonely unconnected situation I should have been condemned to in a Country, where there is not only no happiness, but no amusement out of one's own family, my resolution failed, & I was fortunate enough to connect myself with a young lady whom I had long known to possess a good heart with every advantage of education. The wound which my heart & mind have received is not however to be cured so easily; I still & ever shall remember "that such things were, & were most dear unto me". At the next General Election in November I expect to be in the house again,⁴⁸ & shall then once more commence a career of ambition, more from a wish of employment, than through passion, so that if I am disappointed, it will not mortify me very much. Any Experienced person who were to be informed of our distracted situation in politics, would very reasonably suppose, that the State was falling to pieces very fast, & yet he would be mistaken; for the very evils which are most oppressive, must insensibly & have indeed begun to work their own remedy. The selfish & iniquitous views of a majority in the Assembly are successful, for instance, in shutting up the courts of justice, but as the merchants, whose payments in duties are of so much consequence, and the tenants of the city are availing themselves of that circumstance, the treasury remains empty, the poor are left to their fate, & the streets are unlighted; so that justice between man & man must soon take place again in order to remedy what is still more intolerable than its worst consequences.

You will be pleased to know that my private affairs are in order in consequence of some payments, & some very capital discoveries, which my brother & myself have lately made. I informed You once, that our estate had run us in debt about 9000—but a demand of upwards of £2000 has come against us since. This however has led to an investigation which has been exceedingly advantageous to us, for we have discovered that large quantities of rice had never been put

⁴⁷ After the death of his first wife in 1784, Kinloch had married again, December 8, 1785, this time to Martha Rutledge, eldest daughter of the famous southern statesman John Rutledge. See Mabel L. Webber, "Dr. John Rutledge and his descendants," in *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, XXXI (1930), *passim*, especially p. 17.

⁴⁸ As indicated in the introduction Kinloch had been in the South Carolina House of Representatives in 1779 and was again a member from 1786 to 1788.

to our credit by the merchant, who received the crops of the estate, & that our late brother-in-law⁴⁹ owed us a very considerable sum. I feel myself privileged to tell You of my private concerns, & hope that you will applaud us both for having paid our debts, when there was no law to oblige, & no example to encourage us.⁵⁰ The sales of my crop are about £1800 & my expences, I mean those of the plantation, near four hundred, so that I hope in a year or two still to visit Europe, & am certain that I could live at a much less expence in any part of England, or France, than here.

This letter will be delivered to You by B. Huger, the eldest of my late Brother-in-law's sons.⁵¹ I beg leave to recommend him to Your acquaintance during the little time he stays in England. He is going to Muller, & I flatter myself that the connection will be useful to them both.

Assure Mrs. Boone of my most sincere wishes for the reestablishment of her health, & give my love to her, to Miss Boone, to Miss S. Boone, & to Your Son—I hope the whole family . . . [?] still consider me as one nearly connected with them . . . [?] on & they do justice to those sentiments of unalterable regard, & esteem, which I cherish in my bosom. Inclosed is a bill of exchange which I beg of You to forward under cover to M. Louis De Coppet—à Yverdun en Suisse. A daughter of Sir James Kinloch,⁵² who was by birth entitled to the Gilmerton estate, is reduced so low as to stand in need of £20 to pay her "pension"—I wish my old acquaintance Lady Cunliffe⁵³ knew of it.

Adieu—My dearest best of friends—

Ever Your's F. Kinloch

⁴⁹ Benjamin Huger. See n. 23, above.

⁵⁰ During the Revolution the economic situation necessitated many laws of a moratory character.

⁵¹ He refers to the son of Benjamin Huger and his first wife, Mary Golightly. See "Records Kept by Colonel Isaac Hayne," in *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine*, XI (1910), 33.

⁵² On this Sir James Kinloch, see Francis Kinloch's report in his "Letters from Geneva and France," in *Port Folio*, Ser. II, Vol. VI (1808), 178: "Immediately behind Granson, which you will find on any map of Switzerland, is situated the little village of Giez, where our kinsman sir James K. passed a retired and blameless life of many years: he was heir at law to a good estate in Scotland, when in travelling through Switzerland he became smitten with the charms of a young lady of Berne, of good family, but of small fortune and married her in opposition to the wishes and injunctions of his father: some years before, he had, as was pretended, made a promise of marriage to another person, and as the law of Scotland is far, if I may use a French expression, from understanding raillery upon this subject, he was outlawed and left at his father's death, with no other provision than an allowance of three hundred pounds a year, the estate passing to his younger brother, as if he had been physically dead.—I saw him when I was formerly in this country, and used to admire the cheerful resignation with which he bore his misfortunes."

⁵³ Probably Harriet, daughter of Sir David Kinloch and wife of Sir Foster Cunliffe.

New-port Rhode-Island July 8
1786.⁵⁴

Dear Sir,

My last was by D. Moijes [?], & enclosed a plot of the piece of marsh land, which Miss Boone is entitled to. I also mention'd to You, by the advance of Mr. H. Rutledge,⁵⁵ the lawyer whom I employed on the occasion, that it was necessary, your niece should send over some attested proof of her being the representative of Your brother Daniel,⁵⁶ in which case, the affair would be attended with no further difficulty. You will perceive by the date, that I have changed the heated atmosphere of Charleston for a much happier climate, & no climate surely deserves the appellation of happy more than this, where the sun is only warm enough to bring the fruits of the earth to perfection, where the means of life are cheap, & of the best quality, & where the air is purity itself. I think I have heard You say, that You had been in Rhode-island, & that You were much pleased with every thing but the people. Your observation would be the same if you were here now. I was present at the debate of the lower house the other day, & for the first time conceiv'd some idea of what had carried the inhabitants of this state, & Connecticut so headlong into the war. A little reflection might have told them, that they would infallibly be ruind as merchants, if they succeeded in their politicks; that G. Britain would encourage the fisheries, & oil manufactory of it's own subjects, & that the want of a naval protection would prevent their going into the Mediterranean; but they are descended, as their looks, their language, the cut of their clothes, their wigs, & their religion prove, from those men who first raised the flame of rebellion in England in the last century, & who gloried in suffering for the good old cause—like their ancestors they are uneasy under any form of government, & tyrannical to excess when possessed of power: do but cast your eye over the enclosed copy of an act passed at the last sessions.⁵⁷ It was certainly the will of providence, that America should be independent, for in the Southern states, where no such causes existed, how many others are to be assigned! The Government of Virginia, where the Governor & Council constituted the supreme court in all matters criminal, &

⁵⁴ This letter is in Kinloch's hand.

⁵⁵ Probably Hugh Rutledge (1740-1811), jurist, brother of John and Edward Rutledge.

⁵⁶ See n. 28, above.

⁵⁷ These remarks probably refer to the political and economic difficulties which arose in consequence of the victory of the paper money party in Rhode Island in the elections of May, 1786, and of the establishment of a paper money bank. The act to which Kinloch objects may be the forcing act which subjected any person who refused to receive paper money to a penalty of £100 and the loss of the rights of a freeman. See Samuel G. Arnold, *History of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations*, 2 vols. (Providence, 1894), II, 521.

civil, furnished the Virginians with sufficient Cause to wish for an alteration, & the Gentlemen of Carolina were grown too opulent to be confined to the care of their estates, & stood in need of some skope to that ambition, which of itself takes place in the breasts of those who are rich, idle, & well educated. The consequence of all this is, the Southern people are rather gainers by a revolution which it required some art to make them bear a share in, whilst those of the Northern & Eastern states are ruined by What they were so anxious to bring about. Baltimore, which twenty five years ago did not contain fifty houses, has now two thousand at the lowest calculation, Charleston improves, & Richmond in Virginia has grown into a considerable place. But Boston is going fast to decay, & the ruin'd wharves of NewPort imply a melancholy truth. I every day sail over places where large Warehouses formerly stood, or strike upon the ruins of a wharf at the distance of thirty or forty yards from the shore. New York is still a very agreeable place, but their trade has not as yet by any means recovered the effects of the war, & the change of government. The trade of S. Carolina is about two thirds of what it was before the war in articles of exportation, & our importations will necessarily diminish from a variety of causes. I shall leave my wife here in the course of the week after next, & go to the S. West Mountains on a visit to my friends there, but chiefly to see my little daughter, with whom I mean to pass a week. The stage, which goes near a hundred miles a day, renders such a journey a much easier affair, than it would have been formerly, it carries me within sixty miles of Mr. Walker's.

In a former letter of Your's you desire I would obtain payment from Mr. Gibbes for a parcel of rice sold him by Postale.—I have applied to him, & so has Mr. A . . . [?], but to no purpose; I wish we may either of us ever succeed better. Our paper money in Carolina supports it's credit as yet very well,⁵⁸ & the more easily from the circumstance of it's not being a tender in law. To People who were desirous of paying their debts the loan of £250 was of service, but many individuals have been only encouraged by it to persevere in their extravagance, for Charleston is the place of all others I believe where the greatest numbers live beyond their income. Gen. Greene died a few weeks ago in Georgia⁵⁹ from the effects of a coup de soleil. Though in possession of your land by purchase I have heard him more than once regret that it had been con-

⁵⁸ After the depreciation of the paper money issued during the war, a new attempt to use paper money was made in South Carolina in 1785. "Bills of credit to the amount of £100,000 were issued . . . under the name of paper medium" and "were loaned on interest to the inhabitants in small sums on a mortgage of land or a deposit of plate," the merchants agreeing "to take these paper bills at par with gold or silver." Ramsay, *History of South Carolina*, II, 104.

⁵⁹ General Nathanael Greene died on June 19, 1786, at Mulberry Grove, near Savannah, Georgia.

fiscated. He was the most distinguished of our American Generals, & knew more of the detail of an army, & of the modes of supplying it than any of them. He had as enterprising a spirit as Lord Cornwallis, was as decisive as Lord Rawdon, & knew better than either of them how to extricate himself from a dangerous situation, & yet this man was the son of a Quaker preacher, & having inherited a share in an iron manufactory, has frequently been seen labouring with the hammer in his hand with the reputation of as good a workman, as he was afterwards a general. His person was rather above the middle size, & his countenance a very pleasing one. His wife, who is tout soit peu coquette, was the daughter of very poor parents on Block-island. If such details of our principal characters afford you any amusement, pray let me know, & I will endeavour to enrich my future letters with them.

Long as my letter is I can not conclude it without saying something of her who has brought me once more to have a relish for the enjoyments of life, & to look forward to scenes of increasing domestic happiness. She is the eldest daughter of Mr. J. Rutledge,⁶⁰ has received an excellent education & has known what adversity is. We are old acquaintances, & were always preposed [?] in favour of each other. My life is now getting into that easy channel I was torn from, but with all the merit, the softness & tenderness of my wife, & notwithstanding my hopes of a family which I may yet live to bring up, I can not but remember such things were, & were most dear unto me. God bless You, my dear Sir, & your children to whom I ever shall regard myself as a brother. Mrs. Boone too has my most sincere wishes for her health & happiness. I am & ever will be with truly filial affection

Your's

F. Kinloch.

Pray remember me most affectionately to your brother & to Miss Boone.

Charleston May 26th 1788.⁶¹

My Dear Sir,

As I was in Virginia when Mr. Wragg⁶² arrived, you will not think it strange, that I should have delayed acknowledging the receipt of your's by him, & thanking you for the very elegant seal you have sent me, which I think executed in a manner worthy the intaglios of former days. I begin to think however, that I have committed a mistake, & that this seal is what my Father should have worn, whereas mine, as the representative of my mother, who was an heiress, should have had her shield upon my Father's thus [There follows a drawing of

⁶⁰ See n. 47, above.

⁶¹ This letter is in Kinloch's hand.

⁶² Probably a member of the same family to which William Wragg, a Loyalist leader in South Carolina, belonged.

the shield]. Non nostrum est, you will say, tantos componere lites, but I should really be obliged to you for information upon this subject, for as our steps towards monarchy are very obvious,⁶³ I would wish my Children to have all the Rights to rank, & distinction, which is to be claimed from Ancestry. Mr. Wragg is in the country, & I have not had the pleasure of seeing him, but I have wished him joy by letter of his safe return to Carolina, & assured him, that I should be happy to embrace every opportunity of cultivating his acquaintance; as soon as we meet, I shall take the liberty of advising him, if it should be necessary, to reconcile his mind to the government of the country he means to live in, & I will introduce him to the acquaintance of those who may contribute to make his hours of relaxation from the Law pass most agreeably. Your's of March 10th containing a packet from Muller reached me this morning just as I was setting down to write to you, it encloses a letter from my ward Huger⁶⁴ whose language gives me an idea of what mine must have been to you formerly, & brings home to my mind a very lively sense of all your goodness. Anstey [?] has been sometime in Pennsylvania; whilst here, I frequently mentioned your affairs to him, & could perceive that the very unjust distinction which takes place in restitution, had in some measure it's influence upon his researches. Your losses are however so well authenticated, & so entirely was your estate free from demands of every sort, that you can labour under no difficulties but such as arise from the above-mentioned source. You must have heard of our approaching change of government, which will not I believe surprise you. It is now obvious to every one, that we have not virtue enough for that free form of government in the attainment of which so much blood has been shed, & so much money expended,—& Congress have observed, that the words "recommendation" & "requisition", which were their only engines of power, have no meaning whatsoever in our political dictionary. South Carolina makes the eighth state which has acceded, & the accession of nine states will put the new constitution in motion. We are to have an elective President, who is eligible at the end of every four years for life; he will have a qualified negative on the laws of the new Congress, & will enjoy somewhat more power than the Statholder of the united Provinces, though the Statholder's influence in consequence of many different circumstances is much greater. A Senate, chosen by the different Legislatures of the States, who share the Executive power with the President, & the Legislature with the house of

⁶³ Cf. Louise B. Dunbar, *A Study of "Monarchical" Tendencies in the United States from 1776 to 1801*, in University of Illinois *Studies in the Social Sciences*, X, No. 1 (Urbana, Ill., 1922), especially Chap. VI, "Monarchical Tendencies in the United States from the Close of the Constitutional Convention to 1801." See especially the statement on p. 99, that "Lowndes, in the South Carolina convention, declared, 'On the whole, this was the best preparatory plan for a monarchical government he had read.' It 'came so near' to the British form that, 'as to our changing from a republic to a monarchy, it was what everybody must naturally expect.'"

⁶⁴ Francis Kinloch Huger. See n. 25, above.

representatives,—(this body unites the powers of your privy council & House of Lords, but has no judicial capacity except in cases of impeachment)—& A House of Representatives chosen by the *People* of the different states, which has no right of interference with the Executive, but enjoys the peculiar privileges of your house of Commons. The regulation of Commercial affairs,—the right of imports, of excise, of ordering out & commanding the Militia with many etc. are given up by the individual States to the Federal Government, & we are getting back fast to the system we destroyed some years ago.

[The end of the letter is lacking.]

Book Reviews

Florida, Land of Change. By Kathryn Trimmer Abbey. (Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1941. Pp. xii, 426. Illustrations, maps, appendix, bibliography. \$3.50.)

This book is the result of a double adoption. Dr. Abbey even before taking up the teaching of history in Florida had adopted Florida history as her specialty; and the historical guild and its associates in her adopted state almost as quickly had appropriated her. Readers of this and other regional journals have long been familiar with her scholarly contributions. The Florida Historical Society has often recognized her executive ability. We are now privileged to salute her as Mrs. A. J. Hanna and to anticipate a more prolific output of worthwhile studies from this recent academic union. The present volume, therefore, is a sort of personal and professional milestone for the author and the region she represents.

Dr. Abbey—we may revert to the more familiar designation—presents this history of Florida as “colorful” rather than merely “romantic”; as peninsular, but not exclusively regional. She tries to point out tendencies that link the region with the section, the nation, the colonial empire of which it is a part. To do this, and at the same time to treat adequately the claims of each locality of the state, is no mean feat. Fortunately her knowledge of Florida topography, to which the entire book bears witness, enables her to accomplish this difficult task readily and to apportion to separate localities and to each time period the proper emphasis. At the same time, she does not pretend to be writing a “definitive” history. She knows all too well that there are many gaps in the various archival periods of Florida history, although she and her fellow workers are striving nobly to fill up these lacunae. Incidentally, she shows a comprehensive knowledge both of available primary sources and of leading secondary works and has the ability to use the striking phase in interpreting them.

The work is well proportioned. Four of the sixteen chapters bring the narrative down to 1763—a model of restrained compression, because they make clear the missionary and strategic motives that led the Spaniard to occupy the peninsula and the two implements on which he relied to hold it. Both Menendez and Father Segura failed to make the colony self-supporting and their successors were unable to prevent the encroachment of English and French rivals on this important outpost; but the strategic peninsula became a sort of cultural fringe, sharing to some extent in the development of English Carolina and Georgia,

and of French Louisiana. Pensacola and St. Augustine, by the opening of the eighteenth century, form the foci marking two important subdivisions of the future state.

The next three chapters continue the story through the British occupation—by no means restricted to twenty years of political control—and on through the tempestuous four decades of the second Spanish regime. The author notes that the English had virtually nothing to say of Spanish missionary enterprise, while their two decades of control and subsequent years of economic exploitation reveal their estimate of Spanish prowess in arms. The period of the American Revolution, through which Dr. Abbey first approached this local field, is presented with becoming restraint. The succeeding decades of international intrigue—British, French, Spanish, and American; border and continental; diplomatic and frontier—represent careful gleanings from monographs, bolstered by deft touches from the source materials. A few dates are a trifle askew: "1807" (p. 114), "1812" (p. 120), "1813" (p. 121). Individual figures, both of first and second rank, stand out clearly, while the trend of affairs follows recent interpretation and is presented in Miss Abbey's own compressed but well-chosen phrasing.

The story of the twelve decades since 1821 fills two thirds of the text. Five chapters cover the years to 1861, during which territory and state—approximately the northern half of the peninsula—developed into three sections, of which the middle one, centering around Tallahassee, tended to draw the whole into the pattern of its sister commonwealths. Florida became the typical plantation state, modified somewhat by the products of its pine forests, with Jacksonville supplanting St. Augustine and Fernandina as its eastern outlet, and Pensacola holding commercial supremacy in the west. The middle of Florida grew rapidly enough to prevent the absorption of any part of the state by its neighbors. The state attempted to attract outside capital to build its railroads and establish its banks—with the usual disastrous results. Party politics registered an occasional Whig victory; but like her sister states, Florida showed the inevitable trend toward State Rights Democracy and secession. During the period the Indian presented the most depressing problem, of which the author gives a judicious account. Equally well balanced is her analysis of Florida's part in the Civil War, in which blockade-running and the production of salt form the state's chief contributions. She is thoroughly sympathetic with white supremacy in her chapter on Reconstruction.

The Civil War, as Dr. Abbey points out, fixed a gulf between the plantation state of the prewar period and the peninsular state of modern times. To this new political, economic, and social entity the book devotes the last two chapters. In these the author shows the rise of southern Florida—a later frontier with features appealing to a new type of pioneer, but with many of the problems, albeit in new guise, that troubled the authorities of old. In this portion of her work,

Dr. Abbey has had to rely largely on newspapers and official documents, with some ephemeral books and an occasional biography to help. For, this period, like the second century of Spanish occupation, lacks adequate studies of the documentary sources.

The volume bears an attractive format. The reviewer noted a few typographical and other minor slips: "Piñeda" (p. 9), "Pearl" (Mississippi? p. 112), Tauchipaho (p. 115), "Skipworth" (p. 116), "have" (p. 386). Forty-two maps, portraits and other contemporary prints, and two cover insertions illustrate the text. Familiar names appear in the notes to the text and in the comments and lists of the bibliography. Also relegated to appendices are lists of the governors of four centuries and of the counties of the state in the chronological order. A seventeen-page index gives ready access to any portion of the text. The book should appeal to an audience far beyond the state's borders.

Northwestern University

ISAAC J. COX

North Carolina: The Old North State and the New. Volumes I and II. By Archibald Henderson. (Chicago: The Lewis Publishing Company, 1941. Vol. I, pp. lxxx, 654; Vol. II, pp. 833. Illustrations. \$35.00 the set.)

In his preface the author, with considerable emphasis, disclaims responsibility for any part of this work except the first two volumes, written and edited by himself. From these volumes, since he is writing for the general reader, he has omitted both bibliography and annotation, the latter of which he calls "a swarm of numerical gnats . . . settled on the printed page." A man who has achieved eminence in three separate fields of literature (what we football men call a triple threat) may be conceded to have earned the right to make his own editorial rules, but both the general reader and the historian will regret the omission of a bibliography, which in itself would evidently have been a distinct contribution to history. As for annotation, the author has discarded only the form: the substance of innumerable footnotes is incorporated in the text itself.

In a book by Archibald Henderson, scholarship and style are so much to be taken for granted that comment thereon is unnecessary. What does demand notice is the objective manner of writing, the noncontroversial tone in discussing events bristling with controversy, and the broadness of the author's perspective in handling his theme. Only in connection with the Mecklenburg Resolves and the birthplace of Andrew Jackson does he grow argumentative, and perhaps a trifle pugnacious.

The failure at Roanoke Island (which is described without mention of the "Dare Stones") deferred the colonization of North Carolina until such time as it could profit from the Virginia experiment, deriving thence its plantation economy, its precedents of self-government, and even its first settlers. Chiefly because of its lack of ports, North Carolina was tied to the economic and polit-

ical chariot wheel of Virginia and fretted in its bondage for a century until the development of factories brought relief. The peopling of the eastern coastal plain went on apace under the proprietors, and after authority shifted to the Crown the Germans and Scotch-Irish came in to possess the piedmont. The author is more concerned with the spread of settlement than with the minutiae of government, and he traces it with a wealth of local detail calculated to make the reader (unless he be a Carolinian) go scurrying for a map. A sectional cleavage developed between Plainsmen and Piedmontese which calls loudly for explanation and gets it. With the people in place, Dr. Henderson develops the twofold movement of approaching revolution and transmontane migration. His description of the break with England is wholly devoid of passion, and a detailed account of the Revolutionary years is given without recourse to twisting the lion's tail. He persists in his view that Watauga was an offshoot of the Regulator movement; he discusses the Transylvania enterprise briefly, factually, and with studied restraint. His interpretation of the postwar events of cession, Franklin, and ratification reflects the older (and more orthodox) views and gives little prominence to land speculation as a motive force. The first volume, after carrying the story beyond the War of 1812, closes with a sixty-page description of cultural development. This is the most original, as it is the most interesting, section of the volume.

While the Cherokee were being removed from the mountains, and the white settlers were coming in to complete the peopling of the land, to develop the mines, and to reinforce western sectional demands, the yeast of Jacksonianism began working in the state. North Carolinians were apathetic on the tariff, considering it a hopeless mystery. They were opposed both to nullification and to the Force Bill. While the political pot boiled merrily, the people turned to a revision of their constitution, to the improvement of rivers, to the building of railroads, and to the tentative establishment of public schools. Both economic and educational progress get full description, and this done, the author, after a hurried glance at the "Polk Doctrine," turns to the approaching war. He ascribes to North Carolina a greater war effort than is generally conceded and handles Governor Vance much more gently than the run of recent writers have generally done. North Carolina suffered little from military invasion, was by no means a "prostrate state," and by 1870 was back on its feet despite the antics of the Carpetbaggers, whom the author handles with disdain. There was no break with the past, and under the Bourbons, the new state lifted itself by old bootstraps, finishing its railroads, extending its school system, and rebuilding its factories in their old locations. The discussion of the Farmers' Alliance is less complete than the description of industrial growth, but the interracial friction resulting from the brief Populist-Republican control are clearly set forth. The narrative is carried down to 1940, and the author has achieved the rare feat of describing contemporary events without disproportion or loss of perspective. Volume II

closes as did the preceding one, with a detailed and searching description of cultural growth.

Throughout the work, state affairs are staged against a backdrop of national events. To some it may seem that the backdrop sometimes monopolizes the stage. Some readers may question the utility of the biographical detail found throughout the book. The reviewer considers that Dr. Henderson has produced a model history and has set a mark at which state historians may long continue to shoot.

Florida State College for Women

R. S. COTTERILL

The Secret Diary of William Byrd of Westover, 1709-1712. Edited by Louis B. Wright and Marion Tinling. (Richmond: The Dietz Press, 1941. Pp. xxviii, 622. Illustrations, index. \$5.00.)

Among the more important historical finds of recent years are three fragments of an intimately personal diary kept by William Byrd II. Each, fortunately, is of considerable length and is so separated from the others in point of time as to add greatly to the value of the whole, and to raise the hope that other fragments of a journal apparently kept throughout most of his mature years may in time be discovered. The first, extending from February 6, 1709, to September 29, 1712, has here been transcribed and printed in a handsome volume from the original shorthand copy discovered in 1939 in the Huntington Library. The second, covering the period from December 13, 1717, to May 19, 1721, is in the possession of the Virginia Historical Society at Richmond. The third part, from August 10, 1739, to August 31, 1741, is in the University of North Carolina Library. Plans have already been made for the issuance of this third part as a companion to the present volume. It will be the hope of the entire profession that similar arrangements may be effected for the publication of the remaining fragment. For this diary, judging by the present volume, is a document of extraordinary human and historical interest.

Altogether aside from its own intrinsic worth, the diary is especially welcome because of its bearing on the life of a southern colony. We have been fortunate in having as an aid to the understanding of men of note in the North such items as the diary of Samuel Sewall and the engagingly frank autobiography of Benjamin Franklin. Except for fragmentary remnants of personal and business correspondence, including some of the letters of Byrd's own father, we have, however, lacked comparable aids to the study of the southern planter, a figure no less important to the background of our national life than the Puritan of New England or Mr. Franklin of Philadelphia. Here, at last, the need is met, and happily through a journal that immediately invites comparison with the most celebrated of modern diaries, that of Samuel Pepys.

Students of southern history will find in the diary a wealth of detail and

suggestion, rounding out the picture, correcting accepted impressions here and there, and bringing the whole into sharper relief. A strong light is shed on plantation life. Entries are brief, indeed, at times maddeningly so, and often repetitious. But before us march in daily procession master, wife, children, and servants; while periodically there come and go visiting relatives and friends, an overseer from an outlying plantation, the tearful wife of one recently fired, gentlemen calling to offer their services on a trip to Williamsburg, the minister on his pastoral round, neighbors seeking medicine for a sick member of the family, men settling accounts with Byrd the merchant, men seeking assurance of his favor in their quest of political preferment, and, among the most welcome, shipmasters in with the tobacco fleet and news from England. The scene unfolds against a backdrop rich in the details of provincial life, politics, and economy.

Of the impressions receiving emphatic reinforcement, only a few can be mentioned. As the editors have observed, "Luxurious ease for the owner was the rarest commodity at Westover." The colonial planter, clearly, was a man on whom fell many problems of business management, and to them he gave close personal attention. Requiring much of his time, too, were the public affairs of province, county, and parish. His interest in these reveals the normal mixture of concern for his own advantage and for the welfare of the community. Solicitous and proud of position, keen-eyed for its rewards, he appears here to have been honest and faithful in the execution of its responsibilities. The dominant note of life, except for an occasional state affair, was an easy informality. And even on state occasions, those influences making for rigid formality seem to have beaten a hasty retreat before the common impulse to have a good time. A natural, and often unrestrained, capacity for the enjoyment of a social occasion obviously stands among the more notable features of contemporary society, and serves at times to reveal those complexities of personal relationships that make up a society. Of special interest in this connection is the agreement with Spotswood's servants to remain sober throughout the evening of a governor's ball on the understanding that they might get drunk the following day, which Byrd records they did. Servants and the problems of servant discipline enter frequently into the record. If any one observation is to be made, it is, perhaps, that harshness proceeded more from sudden anger than anything else, that frequently the provocation was great, and the act followed by regret. Finally, mention must be made of the repeated indications of a spiritual and intellectual dependence on the homeland. Life in Virginia was remote and isolated. News, and especially news from England, gave double assurance to the visitor of welcome in the planter's home.

Above all, however, the document is a remarkably frank record of William Byrd himself, a man long recognized, if for no other reason than his celebrated "History of the Dividing Line," as one of the more interesting men of colonial

America. And of him, what now shall we say? Most readers will probably be chiefly impressed by his intellectual interests. Reading with him was not only a principal source of relaxation but a methodical habit. A daily stint, usually in the classics, was set and done as regularly as his morning prayers. His studies included exercises in Latin, Greek, Hebrew, French, Dutch, and Italian. He evidently had standing orders for shipment from England of contemporary publications, and especially of those relating to political controversy. The library was his favorite haunt, and a volume or two from it seem to have accompanied him on his frequent trips from home. In the library, too, he did his writing, which, in addition to a heavy correspondence, included translations and original compositions in verse and prose, done apparently for his own satisfaction rather than for publication. His interest embraced scientific subjects, and especially medicine. He was recognized in the neighborhood as something of a medical authority, and the diary is full of the symptoms encountered and the remedies tried. A mixture of scientific and superstitious interest in dreams runs throughout the journal. His own are many times recorded, the prize example put down after the night he dreamed the lightning "almost put out one of my eyes, that I won a tun full of money and . . . , that I was great with my Lord Marlborough." There are enough such to suggest that Byrd's peculiar ideas on diet were medically unsound.

He usually regarded dreams as a portent of some divine judgment, and his interest in them was obviously joined to a deep religious strain in his character. Sermons, especially those of Dr. Tillotson, provided favorite reading. His attendance at public worship was regular, and his attention to the service was often described as devout. On occasion, he resolved to suspend the common custom of inviting guests home after church in order that his people might have more freedom to attend the services. With all of this, he was a man of the world, shrewd in a business deal, though fearful of a woman's tears, and possessed of a well-practiced eye for a good-looking woman. He was likely to take some liberty with a passing maidservant, or at a party to bring Mrs. Byrd to tears by the nature of his attentions to another woman. For such sins of commission, and for thoughts not always pure, he invariably sought God's forgiveness, but rarely Mrs. Byrd's. Poor Lucy Parke, his first wife! That she was high strung, not the best of household managers, and in other ways a frequent trial to her husband is true enough, but what a trial her husband must have been to her. Though joined in a very real affection, they quarreled repeatedly and heatedly over her discipline of children and servants, her orders of goods from Europe, her desire to pluck her eyebrows for the governor's ball, a new manner of psalm singing in the church, and a host of other subjects and incidents. Reconciliation was never long postponed, but all too typical of the record entered in the journal is that for May 23, 1710: "When I returned I had a great quarrel with my wife, in which she was to blame altogether; however I

made the first step to a reconciliation, to [which] she with much difficulty consented."

It is because of the interest attaching to this, the most human side of the document, that the editors are to be complimented upon presenting an entirely unexpurgated text.

New York University

WESLEY FRANK CRAVEN

Robert Carter of Nomini Hall; A Virginia Tobacco Planter of the Eighteenth Century. By Louis Morton. (Williamsburg: Colonial Williamsburg, Inc., 1941. Princeton University Press, sales agent. Pp. xi, 332. Illustrations, tables, bibliography, \$3.50.)

Dr. Morton's study is the second volume in a series being brought out by the Department of Research and Record of Colonial Williamsburg, Inc., under the general editorship of Dr. Hunter D. Farish. This series is a logical development following the physical restoration of Williamsburg made possible by Mr. Rockefeller. Scholars will have reason to be thankful for the stimulation to accurate research fostered by the Williamsburg group. Already it promises to yield results of genuine significance in the interpretation of our history. The research program is an assurance that Williamsburg will be something more than a charming museum piece; it will make a real contribution to the understanding of a civilization that gave us enduring qualities of leadership.

Robert Carter of Nomini Hall brings together in a useful way an extraordinary amount of information about economic, social, and intellectual life in Virginia in the eighteenth century. Most valuable are the materials on farming and the early industrial attempts. While Dr. Morton's book has the form of a biography, it is concerned less with Carter as an individual personality than with the milieu in which he moved. Robert Carter, known to his contemporaries as "Councillor" Carter, was the grandson of Robert "King" Carter. Like his ancestor, he was a man of affairs, concerned with the management of vast plantations and other multifarious businesses. Plantation life was not the simple, patriarchal, and idyllic existence pictured in too many novels and essays. To stay out of bankruptcy required skill, close application, and a capacity for adaptation to changing conditions. Carter tried many experiments. When tobacco proved unprofitable, he turned to grains, especially wheat, and he planted hemp, flax, and even cotton. Finding slave labor wasteful, he developed a system of tenantry and hired laborers. Not content merely with growing agricultural products, he bought and sold wheat in large quantities, milled his own grains and sold flour and meal, and baked bread commercially in his own ovens. He manufactured textiles on his plantations, invested in a textile mill in Baltimore, and for a time was part owner of the Baltimore Iron Works. During the Revolution he contemplated building a munitions factory and perfected a saltworks which paid a

handsome profit. In short, Carter's business affairs were complex, and the data presented by Dr. Morton concerning the diversity of farming, commercial, and industrial activities in the colony will necessitate some revision of our previous concepts of agrarian society in eighteenth-century Virginia.

Like other members of Virginia's remarkable ruling class, Carter had considerable breadth of cultural interests. He read the best Latin and Greek authors and especially delighted in books on history, philosophy, law, religion, science, and the theory of music. As a musician he was something of a virtuoso, playing on several instruments. Of a philosophic turn of mind, he was eternally searching for an abiding faith, and was by turns an Episcopalian, a deist, a Baptist, and a Swedenborgian. For the tradition that he died a Roman Catholic, Dr. Morton has found no evidence.

Dr. Morton's description of conditions in eighteenth-century Virginia contains so much of value that one wishes he had taken greater care in the organization and presentation of his material. A doctoral thesis, accepted in the department of history at Duke University in 1938, the book still reads in spots like an ill-digested class report. Furthermore, the scholarship in Dr. Morton's field since 1938 has not been very well assimilated. The constant repetition of the same information, everlastingly introduced by the phrase "as has been seen"—sometimes occurring twice on the same page—taxes the patience of the most charitable reader. Errors, omissions, and inconsistencies in quotations—too numerous to list here—mar the book. Names and titles of books are not scrupulously accurate. Sometimes variant forms of the same book title stand in close proximity and are particularly obvious (as on pp. 258-59). Page numbers in citations are not always correct (p. 211, n. 14). Journalese like "the Quaker City" for Philadelphia (p. 238) and solecisms like "the Reverend Madison" (p. 224) are out of place. Carelessness in expression is sometimes responsible for errors of fact, as on page 9 where Dr. Morton asserts that "King" Carter "often visited" London later in life. William Byrd III, not II, married Elizabeth Carter (p. 26). A few weeks spent in revising the manuscript and in checking the references would have saved an otherwise creditable treatise from criticism that an honest reviewer must make. Despite these faults, Dr. Morton's book is one to be recommended to students of colonial life. After sifting a mass of manuscript material, he has brought together significant new data and has interpreted it with insight and understanding.

Huntington Library

LOUIS B. WRIGHT

James Madison, the Virginia Revolutionist. By Irving Brant. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1941. Pp. 471. Illustrations, bibliography. \$4.50.)

The early years of a great man are never lacking in interest, but few great men have had the prescience to preserve adequate records of their rise from the

cradle. The difficult task of surveying the first thirty years of the life of James Madison was undertaken by Mr. Brant because he believed that such a study would add flesh and blood to the historical figure and because he thought that the birth and infancy of the United States also called for re-examination.

A discussion of family and surroundings usually takes the place of personal information for the period of childhood, and the author, taking a running start with Governor Spotswood's "Golden Horseshoe" expedition, has made a good job of the "background." The piedmont country where "Montpelier" stands is of especial interest because it is so little known to historians. The place, responsibility, and interrelations of the dominant families in a Virginia county are well illustrated by the glimpses which are given of several generations of the Taylors and the Madisons, each of which houses furnished a president of the United States. The education of young James, particularly that which he received at the College of New Jersey, is adequately traced. Not only is the development of his intellectual bent made clear, but interesting personal qualities are brought out in the discussion of his friendship and correspondence with William Bradford, son of the Philadelphia publisher of that name.

When Madison emerges upon the political scene, we reach a more familiar story. Yet the spectacle of a man who lacked voice, physical vigor, and personal magnetism, but who was able to attain the top rung of the political ladder, shows that times have indeed changed since the Republic was young. The author stresses especially Madison's championship of the cause of religious freedom, giving him chief credit for the article dealing with that subject in the Virginia Bill of Rights. He also stresses his nationalism, and maintains that the Continental Congress was "a federal government of general powers" before the Articles of Confederation converted it into one of enumerated powers. It is upon this point that he places his greatest emphasis, and quotes even Jefferson as saying in 1784 that "the United States in congress assembled represent the sovereignty of the whole union." The Union is thus portrayed as being older than the states, and the central government as being the original repository of national sovereignty. In following this line of reasoning, Mr. Brant throws himself upon the "sentiment" of the people rather than upon their formal acts, and makes no distinction between a *de facto* and a *de jure* government.

The author has corrected a number of errors made by earlier historians in regard to the life of Madison. His fondness for historical criticism was probably responsible for the inclusion of a detailed discussion of Jefferson's controversy over the speech of the Shawnee Chief Logan, which is hardly germane to the subject. The book is well written, carefully documented, and quite worth reading.

University of Virginia

THOMAS PERKINS ABERNETHY

Empire or Independence, A Study in the Failure of Reconciliation, 1774-1783.

By Weldon A. Brown. (University, Louisiana: Louisiana State University Press, 1941. Pp. ix, 338. Bibliography. \$3.00.)

Empire or Independence is a study of another in the long record of appeasement failures. It traces the efforts, perhaps sincere but all futile, to settle the American Revolution short of revolution and independence, efforts made by leaders of factions both in England and America.

The book deals with American and British compromise proposals and the refusal of each side to entertain the other's ideas. The latter half of the book treats principally the North peace proposal of 1778 and the subsequent failure of the Carlisle Commission.

The results of the investigation may be summarized somewhat as follows:

1. The radical leaders in America sought until 1776 a restitution of the conditions existing before 1763 in regard to their relations with the mother country, but England, by hastily brushing this idea aside, left the colonists only the choice of independence or submission.

2. The North proposal of 1775 and the Howe Commission of 1776 were simply weak temperings of the policy of coercion which North had really decided upon. Prior to 1778 the British government neither offered sufficient concessions to redress colonial grievances nor sent enough troops to put down the rebellion.

3. The genuine concessions offered by North in 1778 arose from the expediency of the moment. To thwart French aid to America, England kept alive the idea of reconciliation; yet it was precisely this fear of reunion that caused France finally to ally with America. American leaders correctly reasoned that the British proposals were based upon despair, and that they were acts of necessity, not choice.

Reconciliation failed for many reasons: (1) Divergent paths of development in colony and mother country made independence inevitable. (2) There was no mutual confidence upon which to base a compromise. (3) Once the war had started, it was too late to reach compromise. (4) Influential Americans after 1775 were prosecuting the war, not thinking up peace terms. (5) No acceptable offer was made until 1778, when England had demonstrated its inability to crush the rebellion. (6) After 1778 reconciliation failed because America did not have to take any terms short of independence, because by actual military victory they had won their objective of a separation.

The discussion of these points is well handled in the body of the text. The English is fluent and correct, and the organization of the material is splendid.

The press work is likewise very good indeed; the index is adequate, the editorial work more than competent, and the appearance of the book attractive.

The Territorial Papers of the United States. Volume IX, The Territory of Orleans, 1803-1812. Compiled and edited by Clarence Edwin Carter. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1940. Pp. ix, 1092. \$2.50.)

This volume is a most welcome addition to the valuable series of published source materials on the history of the territories of the United States. It assembles in convenient form much hitherto unpublished documentary material, not readily available elsewhere, pertaining to the history of the Territory of Orleans. The documents are printed in strict chronological order, beginning with the elaborate preparations made by the United States government for taking formal possession of the Louisiana Purchase in the face of avowed Spanish opposition, and tracing the progress of the Territory of Orleans through the successive stages of territorial organizations until it emerged as the new state of Louisiana in 1812.

Some of the more important topics upon which the volume contains a wealth of information are: (1) the events of the transfer of the Louisiana Purchase from France to the United States; (2) the difficulties encountered in the establishment of the American system of territorial and local government, complicated by the ardent desire of the native Creoles for immediate statehood and their opposition to new forms of administration with which they were unfamiliar; (3) the conflict between the old and new systems of jurisprudence, and the consequent problems involved in establishing the territorial judiciary according to the American pattern, which was strange to the bulk of the inhabitants; (4) the strained relations between Spain and the United States over the transfer, and the anxiety of Governor Claiborne over the lingering of former Spanish officials in New Orleans under various pretexts; (5) the division of the new American residents into two political factions, each seeking to enlist the support of the Creoles in an attempt to control the territorial administration; (6) the attempt to settle the vexing question of disputed land titles and to establish the rectangular system of land survey; (7) the organization of the territorial militia, and the place of the free men of color in this system; (8) the extension of the United States postal system to the territory and the improvement of postal communication with other parts of the nation; (9) the problem of defense of the territory against the threats of Spanish encroachment from Texas and internal commotions, such as the Kemper Insurrection, the Burr Conspiracy, and the West Florida Revolution of 1810; (10) the effort to establish an elaborate system of free public schools along the line of Jefferson's ideas, in a region where the mass of the population had little or no interest in such a forward-looking plan; and (11) the movement for statehood and its successful culmination in 1812.

There is also much material of interest to the biographer and the genealogist in the lists of civil and military officials in the territory and the signatures attached to petitions, as well as in many other documents printed in the volume.

The development of commerce and internal improvement; the fear of slave insurrections, and the anxiety as to the loyalty of the free people of color; the dissatisfaction of the "ancient" inhabitants over the prohibition of the foreign slave trade at a time when citizens of other sections of the United States were still permitted to import slaves from abroad; the problems involved in preventing smuggling and in enforcing the Embargo Act; the high cost of living in New Orleans as compared with other sections of the Union; and a long list of other interesting subjects are here discussed in a variety of documents.

While by no means all the available manuscript materials on the history of the Territory of Orleans are contained in this volume, the abundant footnotes serve to direct the serious research student to a vast store of other pertinent manuscript materials. However, the valuable information contained in the footnotes may offer scant consolation to the student who is not in a position to gain ready access to the sources therein cited.

While all the documents contained in the volume deal with the history of the Territory of Orleans, there is in them much interesting and valuable information on the history of other sections of the South as well as of other parts of the nation.

The printers have done an excellent job and have produced an attractive volume. There is a very complete index. The chief defect in the work is the failure of those responsible for transcribing the documents to decipher correctly a large number of proper names. The reviewer has noted over fifty instances of such incorrect transcriptions, all of which could have been easily detected by anyone reasonably familiar with the old family names of Louisiana. However, the reviewer does not wish to overemphasize this minor defect, which does not materially detract from the great value of the work.

Louisiana State University

WALTER PRICHARD

Journals of the General Assembly of the Mississippi Territory. Journal of the Legislative Council, Second General Assembly, Second Session, October 3-November 19, 1803. Journal of the House of Representatives, Second General Assembly, Second Session, October 3-November 19, 1803. Edited by William D. McCain. (Hattiesburg: The Book Farm, 1940. Pp. 54, 80. \$5.00 each.)

Students will welcome the publication of these documents on the territorial history of Mississippi. We wish to thank the editor for making them available.

In these proceedings we find two future states weaving themselves into the larger American pattern, and at the same time discovering that they are different parts of that pattern. The future division of Mississippi Territory into the states of Alabama and Mississippi is foreshadowed in the expressed concern over "the

insulated situation of the inhabitants of the Tom Becbee." "Washington [County] is situated at so great a distance from this part of the Territory, near to which the judges of our superior court have heretofore resided: in proceeding to that country they have to travel through a considerable tract of Indian land and are liable to many difficulties and delays."

Looming large in the background is Thomas Jefferson. We find his thoughts and words echoed in the address of the territorial governor, William C. C. Claiborne: "With the prosperity of agriculture manufactures will flourish," and "Let the education of our youth then be an object of public concern." Faith of the frontiersman in education is reflected in the assembly's concern over Jefferson College. The recently consummated purchase of Louisiana did not pass unobserved on the Mississippi: "We will venture to assert that in the records of our history all objects of inferior concern sink from view and are eclipsed by the magnitude and grandeur of this acquisition." There was noted a recent memory of Spaniards in Natchez: ". . . to that day of the year 1797 or when Spanish troops finally evacuated the fort at Natchez." Added to the presence of Indians there was, no doubt, a dash of manifest destiny in regard to Spanish West Florida to account for the eager concern shown by Jefferson's letters, Claiborne's address, and the assembly's deliberations in regard to the militia.

Cotton could have been of little consequence in the Mississippi Territory of 1803; yet with the American pioneer's penchant for anticipating the future, the handful of men who composed the assembly concerned themselves over problems of inspection and marketing. Add to this interest in cotton their deliberations on the subject of slaves, and we total up a future stake in the Cotton Kingdom. Thus, taken as part of a greater whole, these documents take on color and significance.

Mississippi State College for Women

MINNIE CLARE BOYD

The American Agricultural Press, 1819-1860. By Albert Lowther Demaree. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1941. Pp. xxii, 430. Illustrations, bibliography. \$4.00.)

Between 1819 and 1860 more than four hundred agricultural periodicals were published in the United States. Most of these were short-lived, lasting less than three years; about a score were published for some five years; and a very few have continued to the present time. The thousands of volumes of these journals constitute a vast storehouse of information about the life of the rural people in general and about agricultural pursuits in particular. It would have been an almost impossible task to write a complete history of all these periodicals. Professor Demaree, therefore, narrowed his problem so as to give "a description of the general content of these journals," "to tell in part the story of rural life as

seen through them," and "to point out the objectives sought by the editors and to describe the methods used to gain these ends." Of the four hundred different periodicals, one hundred were investigated, and sixteen were studied intensively by the author.

Professor Demaree's work is divided into three sections. Part I contains a special study of John Skinner's *American Farmer*, and material of a general nature drawn from the various journals, grouped about such topics as "Program and Policies of the Farm Press," "The Editors," "Special Features," "Ladies' Department," "Rural Poetry," and "The Agricultural Fair." Part II consists of twenty-eight articles reprinted from some eighteen journals, selected in part to illustrate and support the ideas advanced in Part I. Part III is devoted to a special study of sixteen representative farm journals.

This is an important contribution to the literature of the subject and period. The author has drawn together a mass of material and organized it so as to tell a clear, forceful, and interesting story. He shows that the agricultural journals contributed much to the life of the American people. In general the editors advocated liberal ideas and progressive reforms. They attempted, though not always successfully, to break down errors and superstition; and they advocated public education, internal improvements, and humanitarian reforms.

The agricultural press was influenced by sectional viewpoints. For example, the journals of the East opposed westward migration of settlers for fear of bad economic effects on the East. In like manner the journals of the Midwest opposed migration to the Far West. Most of the journals eschewed politics, but those in the southern states were more inclined to discuss slavery than those published in the North.

The author has placed his major emphasis upon the journals of New England and the Middle Atlantic states. Most of his material seems to have been drawn from northern journals, and twenty-three of the twenty-eight articles selected for reprint in Part II are taken from them. He says that relatively few journals were established in the South, but quotes L. C. Gray that there were more than one hundred.

More careful proofreading would have eliminated such errors as "inmportant" (p. xiii) and "contained" for "continued" (p. 14). Claude G. Bowers is cited as Claude C. (p. 401). Franklin L. *Riley* not *Ripey* edited Martin W. Philips' "Diary of a Mississippi Planter." The reviewer fails to see why a journal published at Raymond, Mississippi, should be classed as a western publication; and he feels that Professor Demaree's book would have been even more valuable if it had included a complete list of all the agricultural journals published in the United States.

Diary & Letters of Josiah Gregg; Southwestern Enterprises, 1840-1847. Edited by Maurice Garland Fulton, with an introduction by Paul Horgan. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1941. Pp. xvii, 413. Illustrations, maps, appendices. \$3.50.)

The Santa Fe Trail was the first great western trail and one of the historic highways of America. Its first historian was Josiah Gregg, a trader for nine years (1831-1840), who crossed eight times the border between the United States and Mexico. His classic in the history of the West, *Commerce of the Prairies*, grew out of his habit to "note down everything he deemed worthy of remembrance."

Of Gregg's subsequent life, information has been quite scanty. In his introduction, Maurice Garland Fulton explains that "this book and its companion volume to be published shortly are the outcome of an attempt begun several years ago to collect Josiah Gregg's writings over and beyond the noted *Commerce of the Prairies*." From Gregg's descendants he obtained permission to publish much hitherto unknown material, the most important being about a dozen letters from Gregg to his brother John, and "nine books of 'memoranda' . . . covering his travels and observations for the whole decade from 1840 to 1849." The present volume covers the period from Gregg's retirement from the Santa Fe trade in 1840 to the eve of the battle of Buena Vista, February, 1847. The second volume will contain the account of his career until his death in 1850. The two books appear as volumes in *The American Exploration and Travel Series* published by the University of Oklahoma Press.

The first part of *Southwestern Enterprises, 1840-1847* concerns the "Last Return from Santa Fe" to Van Buren, Arkansas, 1840. The second portion contains Gregg's account of a "Trip into Texas" in 1841, taken "partly on business and partly to see the country." Parts III and IV record an interlude in his life. In 1843-1844 he was in the East to arrange for the publication of *Commerce of the Prairies*, and in 1845-1846 he attended the Medical College of Louisville, Kentucky.

The outbreak of the Mexican War caused Gregg to join the Arkansas Volunteers as "expeditionary aide," a trying position of uncertain rank and duties. With the Arkansas regiment he went to San Antonio, Texas (Part V), then with General John E. Wool's column by a rather circuitous route (Part VI) to Saltillo, Mexico, and twice to Monterey (Part VII). Although he believed the war to be just and hoped that it would reopen the Santa Fe trade, he was shocked by the poor administration of the high command and by the brutalities practiced upon Mexican civilians by some regiments. The volume ends with the departure of Gregg for Saltillo, February 10, 1847, after he had severed his connection with General Wool's campaign.

The Josiah Gregg of this diary and of these letters is not merely traveler,

but scientific observer and historian as well. In a simple, unpretentious style he recorded conscientiously the location of all points visited, the topography, the plant and animal life, the people, the customs, and the history of the regions traversed.

What little editing these manuscripts have required has been, on the whole, well done. Particularly has Professor Fulton shown great perseverance in determining the identity of the many Gregg relatives and acquaintances. In Volume II Paul Horgan will complete his introductory essay, a good appraisal of Gregg as well as a guide for bridging the gaps in the diary.

The present reviewer has but two adverse criticisms to make. The first is in regard to the maps. In a "Map of the Prairies," illustrating the "Last Return from Santa Fe," the southeastern sector is so blurred as to make recognition of place names virtually impossible. For the "Trip into Texas," pages 74-91, no map is included; and a list of unidentified place names appears on pages 86-89. The second criticism is that readers who do not live in the Southwest may be dismayed by lists of flora and fauna, with Spanish names, unaccompanied by explanatory footnotes (e.g., p. 362).

West Virginia University

WILLIAM DERRICK BARNES

Crusader in Crinoline: The Life of Harriet Beecher Stowe. By Forrest Wilson. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1941. Pp. 706. Illustrations, bibliography. \$3.75.)

"So this is the little lady who made this big war," Lincoln exclaimed to Harriet Beecher Stowe in 1862. So runs the Stowe family's account of a famous observation which the biographer, Forrest Wilson, has apparently made the central theme of his book. The Civil War is to Mr. Wilson, whatever historians may think, "Harriet's War," and his critical attitude toward this amazing member of a still more amazing family is at times even unfriendly. But the author adds relatively little fresh evidence beyond what is known to the historian regarding the influence of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* on the war spirit. While Mr. Wilson shows a scholarly zeal in consulting an enormous collection of original sources upon Mrs. Stowe's career, he has preferred to rely on the conventional accounts concerning her relations to her own times. Nevertheless, this biography is easily the most interesting and thorough upon the subject, even rising high above the bulk of popular biographies in other fields.

The first half of the book is a splendid account of the Beecher family and its Calvinist traditions. Catherine Beecher, Harriet's sister, for example, who loses a fiancé in a shipwreck, is disconsolate, not so much because of his death, but that he had never received an inner conviction that he was among the "elect." The correspondence on this subject between Catherine and her father, Lyman Beecher, and a brother, became the starting point of at least two important works

in Calvinist theology! Harriet is portrayed as both intellectual and mystic, not above occasional adventures in crude spiritualism. She came to believe, in later years, that *Uncle Tom's Cabin* was both divinely inspired and written.

The author has carefully traced the origin of the chief characters in this novel to their actual prototypes, showing how the abolitionist influence of Cincinnati and an occasional contact with the Kentucky environment provided the essential setting and point of view. He suggests that Harriet possessed exceptional abilities as a propagandist. Her energies were amazing. "Wife beats the Dutch!" exclaimed her husband in a helpless gesture of admiration. As a mother of seven children and the writer of thirty books—nearly all of them "best-sellers"—there was much to support this view. She was a pioneer in the literary adaptation of the Negro dialect to the novel, hewing a path which the moderns were to follow.

Although the second half of the volume is marred by the needless minutiae of routine narrative, there is nothing dull in the relations of Harriet Beecher Stowe with the British. For many, the glamour of her crusade in behalf of Negro freedom was tarnished by the scandalous publicity in the press that she gave to the personal relations of Lord Byron. Acting on dubious evidence, she offered a shocked nation certain details of Byron's alleged incestuous nature. The British, particularly, who had lionized Harriet, resented this imputation against one of their greatest poets. This incident furnished the most unsavory episode in the otherwise brilliant career of the "first woman in America."

Specialists in southern history may be disappointed in noting how summarily Mr. Wilson dismisses the influence of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* upon the South. Although he notes the rise of an "Anti-Tom" literature, he gives little attention to the crisis that the original novel inspired in southern letters and journalism, particularly in the critical mood of self-analysis which affected the leading periodicals of the South. Indeed, that section had lost its first great battle because of the superior literary outlets and popular support afforded to northern writers.

De Paul University

HARVEY WISH

Cultural Life in Nashville on the Eve of the Civil War. By F. Garvin Davenport. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1941. Pp. x, 232. Bibliography. \$3.50.)

Professor Davenport's vivid description of the cultural evolution of Nashville in the four decades before the Civil War is a significant contribution, not merely to local history but to the social history of the nation. The clash of frontier and "culture" in the "Athens of the South" in this period, resulting by the 1850's in an urbanity which was genuine if not dominant, is an accurate close-up of what was happening in the nation at large. The intellectual maturity of Emerson and Melville had its counterpart in western Nashville, for all its devotion to Poe and Scott.

The frontier town of the 1820's was as crude as the backwoods in which it was to become a prominent oasis. One out of five of its five hundred buildings was built of logs, and its manners caused despair to a Princeton professor, Philip Lindsley, who came down to Cumberland College as president in 1824 to give the community some eastern "culture." "Doctors are made by guess," he wrote, "... lawyers by magic ... parsons by inspiration ... legislators by grog ... merchants by Mammon ... farmers by necessity ... editors and schoolmasters by St. Nicholas."

After thirty years of swift transition, much had changed; for the early crudity, though it still cropped out, was no longer characteristic. The medical school of the University of Nashville and the city's Female Academy were among the best in the nation. An excellent system of public schools, modeled on that of Boston, had been established, as had numerous libraries. Berry's bookstore had probably the finest collection of literary works in the South. To the Nashville theater, where on one occasion standing-room tickets sold for \$3 each, came John Drew, Edwin Booth, Charlotte Cushman, foreign opera companies, Swiss bell ringers, and violinists, all of whom performed in packed houses—even if the public preferred American minstrels as a steady diet. The dramatic and musical criticism of John League Marling, a local editor, was not excelled in Philadelphia or Boston of that day, and the poetry of his mother, Clara Cole, and of Virginia French compared favorably with the best in contemporary America. Nashvillians themselves wrote books and performed in tableaux for charity; German citizens in the 1850's presented Handel's *Messiah*. Despite the disapproval of Protestant churches, local society held grand balls, dressed in the latest fashions, read novels, and patronized foreign dancing masters. Jenny Lind's husband, who disliked the city, admitted that there was "far more female loveliness in Nashville than you will find in any other city in the union." Perhaps the crowning achievement of the era was the construction of a million-dollar, classic capitol.

Much of this, of course, was superficial. Drunkenness still occurred at the theater, and brawls on the streets were common. Religious intolerance and anti-intellectualism prevailed, and probably a majority of citizens got their ideas from Protestant divines who attacked, besides one another, the dance, the theater, and the novel.

Professor Davenport paints the picture of this cultural evolution, if he does not analyze it. His work is one of careful, balanced, accurate, and vivid description, but hardly interpretation. For that lack, he should not be too harshly criticized, since the historian has not yet developed a happy technique for investigating or writing social and intellectual history. Besides, mere description is safer, and the reader can draw whatever inferences he wishes. The innumerable biographies, which are the author's primary device in presenting his story, are sometimes irrelevant, and certainly they break the continuity; but they increase the readability of the book. One has the feeling that there is too much

about certain people in Nashville, and too little about the people of Nashville, but it may be impossible to get at the latter.

If we had a dozen books as good as this on different cities in the nineteenth century, we might begin to write adequate social history of the period.

Newcomb College

G. M. CAPERS, JR.

Justice in Grey; A History of the Judicial System of the Confederate States of America. By William M. Robinson, Jr. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1941. Pp. xxi, 713. Appendices. \$7.50.)

On November 7, 1861, the day after Lincoln's election, Judge A. G. Magrath rose in the old Federal courtroom at Charleston, South Carolina, to announce his resignation from office. "So far as I am concerned," he gravely stated to the grand jury, "the Temple of Justice, raised under the Constitution of the United States, is now closed. . . . May I not say to you, that in the future which we are about to penetrate, next to the reliance" in the goodness of God "should be our confidence in our State and our obedience to its laws." The operation of the laws of the individual southern states from the date of their secession until after Lee's surrender and particularly the laws of the Confederate government is the subject of Colonel Robinson's extensive volume, a volume which despite a few limitations will doubtless rank as the authoritative treatment of the subject. For no one else is now likely to devote the time and energy, the meticulous care, required to cover all the obscure and scattered sources of material or to examine them so thoroughly.

Justice in Grey was published with the aid of a grant from the American Council of Learned Societies. It serves as a welcome contribution to Confederate history from the Harvard Press, now under the direction of a native Southerner, Dr. Dumas Malone. In a lengthy volume, with full annotations and other scholarly appurtenances, Colonel Robinson outlines the legal system in the Confederate States; describes the work of the various courts and judicial agencies, state, Confederate, civil, and military; traces the effort to establish a supreme court and court of claims and presents the Department of Justice "not only as the chief law office of the central government but also as administrator of the Patent Office, the Bureau of Public Printing, and territorial and other affairs committed to its charge." The general reader should find some interesting details regarding such matters as the establishment of the separate Confederate Department of Justice, "the first such subdivision of government in an Anglo-Saxon country"; the languishing and finally unsuccessful effort to establish a supreme court; and the work of the Patent Office. There are also a few enlivening incidents such as the account of the affray in the Confederate Senate when the Honorable William L. Yancey was hit on the right cheekbone by an inkstand hurled by the Honorable Benjamin H. Hill, "causing a considerable flow of blood, as well as ink."

But the great bulk of material covered is necessarily of interest mainly to the specialist in legal or Civil War history. While freely granting that most of this information could not have been condensed without a sacrifice in definitive scholarship, this reviewer feels that some of the technical details could have been eliminated and replaced with more readable facts relating to the personalities involved or, perhaps, legal subjects like the formation of the Confederate Constitution, with its changes from the United States model. In the light of contemporary American history, it is significant to note that the Confederate president was to be elected for one term of six years and could veto specific items in appropriation bills, that department heads were given seats in Congress under certain limitations, and that the process of amending the Constitution was somewhat simplified.

On the whole, Colonel Robinson has made a valuable contribution to Confederate history, with remarkably few errors, considering the magnitude of his task. It is to be hoped that he will soon be able to devote his talents to another book and that he will turn his attention to one of the important phases of Confederate civil history which still lack definitive treatment.

Randolph-Macon Woman's College

ROBERT D. MEADE

Reveille in Washington, 1860-1865. By Margaret K. Leech. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1941. Pp. x, 483. Maps, plates, bibliography. \$3.50.)

"*Reveille in Washington* portrays a half-loyal city, from the doubts of the secession winter to the triumphant grand review of the armies of the republic in the spring of 1865." To a famous novelist it is an "exciting experience and a masterly book . . . a volume of American history written by a woman in a style that is at once authentic, romantic, robust and scholarly." If one accepted the above excerpts from the publisher's jacket, he might assume that at long last the goal toward which all historians strive had been reached. Unfortunately, the volume lacks scholarly organization and balance, and contains no authority for statements of judgment or of fact except the use of unidentified quotations. The bibliography indicates clearly the secondary character of the research.

But let the book speak for itself. *Reveille in Washington*—the story of the capital city in wartime; a series of cycloramic word pictures in journalistic parlance in which the characters, the majority of whom appear to be of equal importance, strut, saunter, or are dragged across the stage into position. Washington—so well described by a foreign correspondent as a "great, scrambling, slack-baked embryo of a city basking in the December sun like an alligator on the mud-bank of a bayou in July" (p. 278). Washington—whose inhabitants read "the young Englishman [*sic*], George Eliot, whose novels were the latest literary discovery" (p. 19). Washington—a city which successively was a sleepy southern village deserted in panic; a barracks overrun by soldiers and by

"daughters of Eve" (p. 261), who lived at the "Haystack," at the "Cottage by the Sea," or at "Madam Wilton's Private Residence for Ladies" (p. 264); a vast entrepôt for war goods and their profiteers; a great sprawling hospital for broken and maimed men; a gay resort where puppets drank champagne or raw whiskey, and danced and laughed in the false prosperity and the demoniac reaction of prolonged war. Washington—where a curious collection of individuals held the spotlight: Scott, whose "sick old body could no longer support the racking of its wounds," and whose "irascibility had dwindled to irritation, and his imperiousness to petulance" (p. 1); Mrs. Greenhow, the Confederate spy, who employed "every capacity with which God had endowed me" (p. 95); Stanton, the "physical coward" (p. 132), "the most hated man" in the city (p. 159), who once said that to serve McClellan he "would be willing to lay down naked in the gutter and allow him to stand upon my body for hours" (p. 176); McClellan, who acted with "unparalleled insolence" to Lincoln (p. 119); and Louisa M. Alcott, who kissed the soldiers good-bye when they went off to join their regiments (p. 224).

Since this is a book which fails to meet many standards of the critical student of American history, it must be reviewed as a currently popular miscellany, loosely held together by time and geography, which has had the good fortune to be published at a propitious time. It is good journalism, written by an author who uses descriptive phrases with abandon, who paints word pictures that many historians will appreciate and profit by, and who gives the reader an unforgettable impression of Washington in wartime. It is an admixture of keen insight and free-rein writing. Most professional historians will read *Reveille in Washington* with a jealous and choleric eye, for they must produce works which are based on more judicious and exhaustive research, and which, in the interest of sound scholarship, are usually presented in a style anathematized by the buying public.

Louisiana State University

EDWIN A. DAVIS

The Civil War Career of Thomas A. Scott. By Samuel Richey Kamm. (Philadelphia: The Author, 1940. Pp. vi, 208. Bibliography. \$2.50.)

Well taken is the author's position that the civilian leaders of the Civil War period have been neglected by biographers. Undoubtedly one of the chief causes of that neglect is the lack of sources from which information may be drawn. Public men, whether civil or military, must of necessity leave many official and personal records in addition to the notices that appear about them in the public press. Of civilians, in too many instances, the very opposite is true. Thomas A. Scott is a case in point. He left no collection of private papers. Mr. Kamm, however, has surmounted this obstacle admirably, and his success should encourage others to try.

When the Civil War opened, Thomas A. Scott was vice-president of the Pennsylvania Central Railroad. Like many another businessman of the time, he had already earned "his reputation as a corrupter" of legislators (p. 185). Nevertheless, Governor Andrew G. Curtin, knowing his managerial abilities, called him into service to dispatch the Pennsylvania volunteers through Harrisburg to Washington. The destruction of the Baltimore and Ohio tracks by Maryland secessionists led Scott's former business associate, Secretary of War Simon Cameron, to call him to Washington; there he became general manager of government railroads and telegraphs in the vicinity of the capital. The high order of his work influenced Congress, in August, 1861, to create the office of assistant secretary of war, and Scott became its first occupant.

The appointment of Edwin M. Stanton as secretary of war marked the end of Scott's real influence in Washington. Stanton used him, nevertheless, to make a very important survey of military posts and transportation facilities in the Ohio and Mississippi valleys. Even after he had resigned, Stanton recalled him to superintend the Kentucky phase of the movement of more than 13,000 troops by rail from the Army of the Potomac to reinforce General W. S. Rosecrans in Tennessee. Earlier that same year, 1863, Scott had been Governor Curtin's right arm in organizing Pennsylvania forces to meet the Lee invasion that halted at Gettysburg.

A few minor errors that appear in the book—such as reference to the *Dictionary of National Biography* (p. 26) when the *Dictionary of American Biography* was meant; 1826 for 1862 (p. 81); anomaly for anomaly (p. 124)—should have been prevented by careful proofreading. The numerous split infinitives will give distress to stylists, while the inclusion of a few simply drawn maps—showing, for example, the locale of Scott's work in Kentucky and the Gettysburg campaign—would give a clearer picture to the average reader.

Such inconsequential criticisms are in themselves evidence of the merit of the work. Carefully documented, well organized, based on wide evidence, told with an easy variety of sentence structure, it should occupy a high place among doctoral dissertations. It gives promise of more to come from the same author on the same subject. The account of Scott's postwar career should be of great interest and importance.

Ohio State University

HARVEY M. RICE

The Northern Teacher in the South, 1862-1870. By Henry Lee Swint. (Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press, 1941. Pp. ix, 221. Map, appendices, bibliography. \$2.50.)

During the last years of the Civil War and in the succeeding period of Reconstruction, the South was invaded by a veritable army of northern school-teachers and missionaries. Nearly ten thousand of these were officially reported

in 1869, and the actual number of those who came was undoubtedly much greater. Sponsored by the Freedmen's Bureau and also by various benevolent societies, commissions, and associations, these men and women considered themselves the spiritual followers of the armies of Grant and Sherman, and with Bible and spelling book they hoped to make secure the victory which the North had won with the sword. With a "thorough, Christian, Yankee teacher" in every southern county it was planned to "redeem and regenerate" the section which had sinned by holding to slavery and rebelling against the Union, and by means of a New England leaven it was hoped to transform "the whole lump of Southern ignorance and prejudice." Also the freedmen must be taught "the intelligent use of the ballot," and there is some evidence that the economic possibilities of the program were not ignored by its sponsors. But the abolitionist sentiments and equalitarian practices of the northern teachers were anathema to the southern white, and it was inevitable that their efforts should meet with vigorous and sustained opposition in the South.

This volume, the second to issue from the recently established Vanderbilt University Press, examines the relationships, motives, attitudes, and experiences of those individuals who engaged in teaching the freedmen of the South during the period 1862-1870. The scope of the study is strictly limited to these years, and it is therefore not concerned with the more recent extraregional aids that have been extended to education in the South. Nor is any attention given to schools and colleges established for Negroes during the period under consideration. No attempt is made to evaluate the actual results of the work of the teachers in a pedagogical sense, and scrupulous care is taken to avoid the controversy between those who affirm and those who deny that the work of northern teachers and politicians laid the foundations of the South's public-school system. Thus the work is not to be regarded as a study in educational history, but rather as an account of one phase of Radical Reconstruction and its effect upon the white people of the South.

The evidence here adduced points definitely to the conclusion that the majority of the northern teachers were ill-fitted for the work that they had undertaken. They were incapable of calm consideration or of restraint. The "carelessness and neglect" apparent in southern villages grated harshly upon their "New England ideas of order and thrift." They extended their teaching into the controversial fields of "sociology and politics," and thus, at the outset, destroyed any possibility of securing co-operation from the southern whites. At the same time, it is made clear that southern hostility to the northern teachers did not extend to Northerners in general. Northern businessmen were welcomed in the South, and northern immigration was heartily encouraged. Nor was the South primarily opposed to Negro education. But it correctly understood the importance of the "Yankee schoolmarm" as a means of controlling the vote of

the new citizens, and thus the education of the freedmen came to be opposed along with other features of Carpetbag and Negro activity.

Within the limits set by the author, the study is creditably executed. The manuscript records of the Educational Division of the Freedmen's Bureau are used to good advantage, as are the files of various freedmen's and missionary magazines of the period. Three appendices supply notes on selected officers of the educational associations which sent teachers to the South, names of the officers of the leading associations, and an extensive list of northern teachers in service in the South, 1862-1870, whose homes have been located.

Converse College

JAMES W. PATTON

Charles Egbert Craddock (Mary Noailles Murfree). By Edd Winfield Parks. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1941. Pp. x, 258. Plates. \$2.50.)

Mary Noailles Murfree (1850-1922), whom her biographer terms "a gifted amateur of letters," was one of the best of the southern local colorists who were popular in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. She was not the first to write of the southern mountaineers, but it was she who first brought that region within the ken of the American reading public, and none of her numerous successors has portrayed the region quite so memorably as she. Brought up in the home of a cultivated lawyer and planter of Murfreesboro, Tennessee, who encouraged her to write, she attained her first notable success in May, 1878, when the *Atlantic Monthly* published "The Dancin' Party at Harrison's Cove." In 1884 her publishers brought out a volume of her *Atlantic* stories under the title, *In the Tennessee Mountains. The Prophet of the Great Smoky Mountains* came out the next year. Until that time even her editor and publishers had not suspected that Charles Egbert Craddock was a woman. When she walked into the *Atlantic* office and announced her identity, Thomas Bailey Aldrich, the editor, was amazed. Now one of the most popular of short-story writers, Miss Murfree quite naturally wrote too much. Her later stories were nearly all constructed on the same formula, and in a few years her vogue began to wane. In 1912 she sold the rights to her numerous books for a sum less than twelve hundred dollars. When she died ten years later, she was relatively unknown to the reading public.

Local color, as Dr. Parks makes clear, was a static art. Like other writers of her time, Miss Murfree combined a romantic plot with a degree of realism in her treatment of dialect and local customs. She was not critical of her own work, and she did not understand her own limitations. She seldom portrayed young men effectively, and she treated few mountain types except the poor white. Although for fifteen years she had spent her summers at Beersheba Springs in the Cumberland, she pictured her characters mainly from the point

of view of an outsider. Her stories contain too many lengthy descriptions of mountain scenery, to which her characters, as she admits, were quite indifferent. She gave the public what it then wanted: sentiment, morality, pictorial qualities. It was characteristic of her that when Walter Hines Page suggested that she ought to paint the mountaineer as doomed by environment and lack of opportunity, she resented his advice. Yet with all her limitations, she left a few memorable books. *In the "Stranger People's" Country* (1891) seems to her biographer the most artistic of her novels.

This brief summary is based, of course, on Dr. Parks's account of Miss Murfree's development. He has given us the essential facts and has interpreted them correctly, and his book fills a definite need. Although he acknowledges considerable assistance from the Murfree family, his book is no official biography. If the book impresses some readers as less mature than some of Dr. Parks's other publications, it should be borne in mind that this book, a Vanderbilt dissertation, was written several years ago and was withheld from publication for reasons not the fault of the biographer.

Duke University

JAY B. HUBBELL

Father of the Blues; An Autobiography. By William C. Handy. Edited by Arna Bontemps, with a foreword by Abbe Niles. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1941. Pp. xiv, 317. Illustrations, appendix. \$3.00.)

Few Americans can claim to have reached a larger audience than W. C. Handy. His "St. Louis Blues" is a jazz classic, one of the universally known American musical compositions. The story of the writing of this and other famous blues, developed from songs sung by southern Negroes, is related in his autobiography. But the book is more than a study in musical origins. It is also the warming and engaging account of the rise of a Negro from an Alabama cabin to his present position as a publisher and song writer in New York.

Handy first wrote his material under the significant title, "Fight it Out." His musical career began in the face of the opposition of his father, a stern Methodist minister, who regarded a guitar as a "devil's plaything." He played with minstrel shows, but there were periods when he was a schoolteacher, ditch digger, iron puddler, and down-and-outer, including one time when he slept on a St. Louis street. The chapters on the Mahara Minstrel Show and his struggle to keep his band intact in Memphis during the heyday of Beale Street present excellent source materials in social history. Through it all, he was sensitive to slights from the dominant race, although his native humor and charity inevitably healed the hurts. Through the chicanery of a white man, he received only a hundred dollars for the first blues hit, the "Memphis Blues," but came to regard this "bungled bargain" as one of the long list of exploitations of composers and inventors.

Each of Handy's blues uses a snatch of folk melody in one or two strains of an otherwise original song. He heard these folk melodies everywhere. "Give a Negro any incident, and he will make a song about it—if he feels bad enough." Part of the "John Henry Blues" is based on a tune Handy heard in a rock quarry. One of the three strains in "Sundown Blues" is a levee song. The "Joe Turner Blues" evolved from a chain gang melody. "Loveless Love" and "Aunt Hagar's Blues" are traceable to folk ancestry. The "St. Louis Blues," "the work of a single evening at the piano," was (Handy believes) partially the product of hardships suffered in St. Louis, and "reflects a life filled with hard times as well as good times."

Soon after the publication of this volume, a Victor record album (No. P-82) of eight Handy blues numbers, designed to accompany the book and played by the Dixieland Jazz Group of NBC's Chamber Music Society of Lower Basin Street, was released. The readers of this magazine who may occasionally find relief from historical labors in popular music are advised that this group of records, including especially Lena Horne's rendition of "Beale Street Blues," are both heart- and foot-warming. The same cannot be said for a recent moving picture based on the book.

W. C. Handy's claim that, as a Memphis resident, he was the first to put blues on paper remains uncontroverted. Neither can it be denied that he has been the most important medium in the development of what some believe to be the South's most important cultural achievement. As an interpreter of folk music, Handy deserves to be ranked with such composers as Smetana, Liszt, and Dvorák, even though their productions were finished in much more elaborate fashion.

Louisiana State University

WILLIAM R. HOGAN

Florida: A Guide to the Southernmost State. American Guide Series. Compiled and written by workers of the Federal Writers' Project of the Work Projects Administration for the State of Florida. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. xxvi, 600. Illustrations, maps, bibliography. \$2.75.)

When the Federal Writers' Project, some eight years ago, undertook the program of preparing the *American Guide Series*, it entered an almost virgin field. In spite of the fact that for years European nations had realized the value and need for authentic guide material, the United States had left this matter to chambers of commerce and tourist agencies. The result was a quantity of highly colored, inaccurate, localized material, which was special pleading for the place or section in which it was interested. Regions which attracted a large number of travelers were more sinned against than parts of the country which led a more unfrequented existence; thus Florida, her past, present, and future, came in for an overdose of flamboyant and farfetched claims and assertions. The first service which the volume under consideration renders its subject, therefore, is that it

pictures the state in the light of an honest and painstaking effort to assemble and interpret reliable data. Consequently, there stands forth a Florida of contrasts, rapid and amazing progress accompanied by social and economic lags. Much of the material in the introductory chapters is made especially useful by the fact that there is so little being written on contemporary conditions in the state. The bibliography at the end of the volume gives numerous aids to finding material in government pamphlets, both Federal and state.

The form of the Florida guide follows the pattern described for all state books of the series. It is divided into three main parts. Part I consists of chapters on the region as a whole, its topography, natural resources, social and industrial development, and one chapter on its history. These chapters are well done, even though an occasional statement or figure may be challenged. Part II is devoted to a somewhat detailed discussion of the most important cities of Florida. The third part of the guide contains the tours which the motorist may take through the state. Since the book has been in circulation for almost two years, experience with the suggested tours is available. They have been proved exceedingly useful and interesting; the verdict of those who have tested them is highly complimentary.

The nature of the *American Guide Series* is such that the volumes will become out-of-date unless they are revised at intervals. It is hoped that this will be done, and that the Federal Writers' Project, which has begun something valuable and useful, will continue its assistance to American travel and self-knowledge.

Winter Park, Florida

KATHRYN TRIMMER ABBEY

Louisiana: A Guide to the State. American Guide Series. Compiled by workers of the Writers' Program of the Work Projects Administration in the State of Louisiana. (New York: Hastings House, 1941. Pp. xxx, 746. Illustrations, maps, bibliography, appendices. \$3.00.)

The stated purpose of this book "is to present as complete a picture of Louisiana as possible within the limits of a volume that is not too unwieldy." Following the general plan of the *American Guide Series*, it forms a veritable encyclopedia on the state.

There are four divisions of unequal length. Part I contains information on the "past and present" of Louisiana, arranged under the topics of natural setting, first Americans, history, government, agriculture, commerce, industry and labor, transportation, racial elements, folkways, social life and welfare, education, religion, newspapers and radio, sports and recreation, architecture, art, literature, music, the theater, science, and the cuisine. Sixteen cities and towns are described in Part II. A short history and a discussion of the industries, transportation, and social life of each are given. In Part III, the longest section of the book, forty-three tours are described in detail. The fourth section, "Appendices," has five

divisions: glossary, chronology, bibliography, population figures, and an index. The most interesting, if not the most valuable, feature of the volume is embraced in the sixty-four pages of gravure illustrations. Its usefulness is enhanced by thirteen maps.

The reviewer questions whether the authors have succeeded in their purpose of producing a guide "that is not too unwieldy." There is a total of 776 pages set in small type. The Louisiana Highway Commission published a seventy-two page booklet in 1932, entitled, *Louisiana: A Tourist Guide to Points of General and Historical Interest*, which was probably more convenient for tourists to use. The volume under consideration, however, will serve a most useful purpose because of its inclusiveness. Scholars who desire a "complete picture of Louisiana" in a single volume will consult its pages with much satisfaction.

In a work of this length, a few slips seem inevitable. But criticism for minor mistakes appears trite when the volume has so many commendable features and fills a distinct need.

Louisiana Polytechnic Institute

GARNIE WILLIAM MCGINTY

Maryland: A Guide to the Old Line State. American Guide Series. Compiled by the workers of the Writers' Program for the Work Projects Administration in the State of Maryland. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1940. Illustrations, maps, bibliography. \$2.75.)

The *American Guide Series* for the various states, many volumes of which have now appeared, has set a new standard in guidebooks. The volume on Maryland, which has at long last issued from the press, measures up well with its companion volumes in the series—indeed, in the judgment of the reviewer, it may well be ranked in the front row.

The book is arranged in four parts. Part I consists of twenty short chapters affording to the general reader a survey of the social aspects of the state's history. After an introductory chapter, rather happily christened "Maryland, My Maryland," there is a treatment of the geography and geology of the state, an account of the Maryland Indians, and a summary of the political history. Then follow, among others, discussions of the racial elements, agriculture, industry, labor, transportation, the press, architecture, music, and even a chapter on the much vaunted Maryland cookery. Research workers who have wandered into compiling a guide show the influence of thorough training, and have applied research methods to most of the topics, but have manifested restraint in the amount of detail perpetrated upon the reader. At times this work may strike the cursory reader as heavy, but what has been achieved is an encyclopedia on the state rather than a mere guide.

Most recent comers to Maryland and perhaps even many native-born will peruse the volume with profit and add to their body of information concerning

the state. Scattered here and there are delightful tidbits, such as the account of the strange bequest of several hundred thousand dollars by a native son to the Johns Hopkins University for an auditorium embellished with portraits of women he had found beautiful (p. 3), or the fact that Cecil Calvert ordered enough rough matting from the Indians to carpet his house—some three hundred and fifty yards (p. 19).

Part II discusses only seven municipalities, owing to the paucity in Maryland of large cities outside the one metropolis. Here the treatment follows more closely that of the conventional guidebook, though achieving distinctly more. Part III offers the motorist some forty well-planned tours, to which fully half the volume is devoted, and for which the earlier portion serves as background. A table of chronology and a well-classified bibliography comprise Part IV.

On the whole, there is much good writing, especially in the introductory chapter and in the chapter on architecture, to add to the attractiveness of the work. The illustrations are excellent, and as a piece of bookmaking, the volume lives up to the standard of the Oxford University Press. It is perhaps inevitable in a work of this kind that some errors should have been made. Indeed, it is surprising that there are not more. Out of the mosaic of the various chapters with their varying colors emerges a picture of Maryland which Marylanders will probably accept as authentic. Best of all, the book should be a stimulus for further writing on the Old Line State, as suggestions dropped through its pages await more elaborate development.

Goucher College

ELLA LONN

Records of Rhea: A Condensed County History. By T. J. Campbell. (Dayton, Tennessee: Rhea Publishing Company, 1940. Pp. 205. Illustrations, bibliography. \$1.50.)

This brief sketch of the history of the Tennessee county that has as its county seat the town that is probably more widely known than any other in the state, because of the notorious Scopes trial in 1925, is of more value to genealogists and antiquarians than to students of history. A large part of the work is devoted to the names of county officials and Rhea County soldiers and to sketches of family histories. At the end of the volume there is an illustrated "Memorial Section" dedicated to "Some of those who have contributed and are contributing to the development and progress of Rhea County," which includes a picture and sketch of William Jennings Bryan and a tribute to the university at Dayton, Tennessee, which bears his name.

Possibly because the work was written shortly before the death of the author, it is rather loosely organized and characterized by considerable repetition. One chapter is entitled "History at Haphazard." Mr. Campbell, the author of *The Upper Tennessee*, had been engaged for many years in gathering material on the

history of Rhea County and believed quite justifiably that the results of his research should be made accessible. The brief historical section is in general very accurate, and, although almost devoid of footnotes, it appears from the context and the brief bibliography to be based to a considerable extent upon documentary material. Considerable use was made not only of printed governmental records but also of some manuscript material, particularly of a diary kept by one of the early settlers of the county. Although the major emphasis is placed on political history, an effort was made to analyze the effects of the building of the Cincinnati Southern Railroad through the county during the 1870's.

The sensational trial which put Dayton on the map and gave the state and region such undesirable and distorted publicity is dismissed with a page and a half discussion. Attention is called to the now generally accepted "drug store conspiracy" origin of the case, and considerable resentment is expressed against certain "wise men of the east" who attempted to use the trial as a sounding board from which to attack "Southern barbarism."

Although padded somewhat with genealogical data, *Records of Rhea* is a convenient and reliable summary of the essential facts in the history of the county, written by a long-time resident. It reveals, however, as is usually the case with this type of work, inadequate understanding of the general historical background.

University of Tennessee

STANLEY J. FOLMSBEE

Studies in Georgia History and Government. Edited by James C. Bonner and Lucien E. Roberts. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1940. Pp. xiv, 284. Bibliography. \$2.50.)

This volume is of a genus rare in the South. It is a collection of twelve essays presented to Professor John Hanson Thomas McPherson by eleven of his former students in appreciation of his half century of teaching at the University of Georgia. If proper allowances be made for the relative handicaps of the institution from which the book emanates, and for the neophyte press by which (with the aid of 155 patrons) it has been issued, it will be found to compare favorably with similar products of northern scholarship. Congratulations are in order for creditable features in these studies; yet its appearance should be welcomed as a step in the right direction even if extended apology were necessary. Moreover, one is irresistibly tempted to add, events subsequent to the appearance of this publication seem to dictate compassion for a once-glorious institution whose hopes of regaining lost heights have been darkened by a foreboding political cloud. It would appear that the reputation won for the school of Stephens and Cobb by Edd Winfield Parks's recent *Segments of Southern Thought* and by the current volume of its budding press is to be more than counterbalanced by undeserved factors beyond its control.

As is true in most collections of this sort, there will be found here some papers which would not elsewhere have been put into print, for the editors have taken their studies largely where and as they found dormant manuscripts. This is not to imply, however, that tangible worth cannot be discovered in each of the contributions. One of them reviews religious factors in the settlement of the colony; two summarize Indian affairs on the Cherokee and Seminole frontiers; in the field of economic history, there are studies of Savannah River commerce and of ante-bellum agriculture; and military and educational history are not omitted. An exposition of the political plague of local legislation by the state legislature highlights three chapters in the field of government, and political history is represented by analyses of legislative reapportionment problems from the Revolution to the Civil War, and of dominance by the Farmers' Alliance in 1890—capable studies by the editors which it is not invidious to note as being superior to most of the others.

Each chapter is adequately, but sometimes naïvely, documented at the rear of the volume rather than with footnotes, and a routine sort of index completes a publication which goes off the beaten track of Georgia's story. Its chief merit lies in its condensations of somewhat unexplored topics, and its pioneering scholarship is appropriately plain rather than fancy, methodically workmanlike rather than brilliant.

Mary Washington College

W. EDWIN HEMPHILL

Symbols of the South: Education and Early Life in Richmond under Tutorship of Miss "Jennie" Ellett. By Josephine Augusta Clarke Knight. (Richmond: Garrett and Massie, 1941. Pp. xvi, 113. Illustrations, index. \$3.00.)

This book deals with the career of a beloved Richmond schoolmistress, Miss Virginia Randolph Ellett, whose life spanned a period from the years immediately preceding the Civil War to April 9, 1939. In the middle 1880's "Miss Jennie" started a private school for girls at 109 East Grace Street, subsequently moving to famed "Linden Row" on East Franklin, and later still to the old Slater mansion at No. 14 North Laurel Street. In 1917 Miss Ellett's School, by this time known as the Virginia Randolph Ellett School, was incorporated under its present name of St. Catherine's, with Episcopal connection, and in 1920 it moved into its new quarters at Westhampton. Such is the bare outline of the educational achievements of a gifted woman who for two generations furnished the preparatory training for many of the leaders of Richmond's social and cultural life.

Unfortunately, Josephine Augusta Clarke (Mrs. John D.) Knight has produced a very inadequate study of a notable career. It is painfully sentimental, out of proportion, so poorly written that often the meaning of sentences can only be surmised, and very untrustworthy in its statement of "facts." As an illustration

of the last point, the ancient Richard Adams mansion—owned for a time by Miss Ellett's paternal grandparents and subsequently incorporated into the Monte Maria Convent—is not standing, as the author thinks, but was torn down in 1928. Again, the old First Baptist Church (which became the African Baptist Church when the building was given to the Negroes before the Civil War) was not on Church Hill, but rather a mile away on Shockoe Hill, at the northeast corner of Broad and College streets.

Despite the pretentious title, this book is in no sense a significant study in regional culture, and there is no aspect that will withstand critical appraisal. As a matter of fact, it should never have been placed before the public in its present form. If it had been thoroughly revised it might have made a worth-while contribution in the re-creation of a vanishing period of Richmond's history, with which the singularly useful life of Miss Ellett was an integral part.

Nashville, Tennessee

WIRT ARMISTEAD CATE

A Socio-Economic Survey of the Marshdwellers of Four Southeastern Louisiana Parishes. By Edward J. Kammer. (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1941. Pp. xii, 180.)

This book is a good descriptive survey of the life and labor of the marshdwellers of Jefferson, Lafourche, Plaquemines, and St. Bernard parishes. In the marsh section of these four southeastern Louisiana parishes live a variety of ethnic elements (principally French, Spanish, Italian, and Slavonian) numbering about 20,000, of whom roughly three fourths are either directly or indirectly occupied in trapping furbearing animals (mostly muskrats) and fishing (shrimp, oyster, and crab). With the exception of the Slavonians, who maintain distinct cultural patterns, most of the other peoples have accepted the culture of the dominant French group.

Dr. Kammer begins with a historical sketch of the four parishes, and devotes one chapter each to the family, religion, education, recreation, and social change. He completes the study with a description of the economic factors together with a chapter on health conditions.

About 90 per cent of the population is Catholic at least in name; the average number of children per "completed family" is 4.5; the illiteracy rate is higher than that for the state; dancing is the most popular form of recreation, followed closely by excessive gambling, which Kammer calls the "curse of the area." During the 1939-1940 season, the average landowning trapper earned between \$630 and \$720; the average share trapper, between \$410 and \$468. In many cases this income was supplemented by fishing.

Since 1938, the development of oil fields has introduced social changes; this new economic factor, however, may prove a serious threat to the livelihood of the marshdwellers.

Louisiana State University

VERNON J. PARENTON

COMMUNICATIONS

Stanford University
November 11, 1941

THE MANAGING EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL OF SOUTHERN HISTORY:

I feel that I should not let pass without protest the misstatements which appeared in Professor Hayes Baker-Crothers' review of my book, *The Background of the Revolution in Maryland*, printed in the May issue of the *Journal of Southern History*. I do not complain about his judgment of the work as a whole, which seems to lie in a balance of comment, more of it favorable than unfavorable. But it does seem to me that he misrepresents the character of the book in a way which is unjust to reader and author alike.

The comment which most concerns me is the following: "The last seven chapters are devoted to that popular and important topic which engrosses the attention of most authors of this period of colonial history—the contest between the lower house with its local and parliamentary viewpoint and the upper house, governor, king or proprietor with the prerogative viewpoint. Dr. Barker gives the greater part of his book to this struggle. . . ."

This statement is such an exaggeration of the space I do give to assembly politics that it is hard to believe that the reviewer has read thoroughly Chapters IV-X, on which he is commenting. Specifically, Chapter IV is an institutional and financial analysis of "The Proprietary Element," and only a few pages have any direct reference to the struggle with the lower house; Chapter V is a contrasting analysis of "The Representative Element," but is more political in content and is more justly covered by the comment; Chapter VI, on "Maryland in the British Colonial System," is about one third devoted to the struggle; Chapter VII, "The Anti-Proprietary Movement," is entirely so devoted; Chapter VIII, "Proprietary Affairs under Governor Sharpe," is entirely off the point of the assembly struggle; Chapter IX, on "Resistance to Imperial Reform," is about one fourth a matter of assembly relations; and Chapter X, "The Final Crisis," is about three fourths such a matter. The reviewer would have been correct if he had said that about half of these chapters, or one third of the book, is devoted to the struggle. Of course, the thing that troubles me is that the misstatement attributes a false character to the book: it makes my study of revolutionary origins seem much more political, and much less economic, social, and institutional, than actually it is.

The injustice of this misstatement about the proportions of the book is most specific in the instance of the religious problem. Towards the end of the review, Professor Baker-Crothers says that "greater emphasis might also have been placed on the religious issue" in a period approaching church disestablishment. With the literal wording of this criticism I cannot quarrel; indeed, I wish that I had had such ampler materials or deeper insights as would have justified me

in making more of religious affairs. But in the context of the review this criticism is tantamount to saying that I have little or no important religious material—the part of the review first quoted says that Chapters IV-X are devoted to the assembly struggle, and the part which contains a detailed analysis of Chapters I-III omits any mention of my discussion of religious conditions. The reviewer should reread pages 10-11, 15-16, 25, 43-52, and 93, in Chapters I-III, and pages 148-53, 216, 275-89, 358-66, and 371, in Chapters IV-X. Actually about one tenth of the text has to do with religious questions; the material is little-known and is altogether based on fresh research. I do not think that Professor Baker-Crothers should have made either of the comments which I have quoted without reference to that aspect of my work.

I have two other specific objections to the review. One fourth of it, two paragraphs indeed, in discussing a couple of samples of my reasoning, is devoted to certain small matters contained within three pages (95-97). But even here the reviewer's criticisms are inconclusive; and in one instance the comment ("he . . . enumerates sixty vessels") misrepresents the text. The concluding observation, though not adverse in tone, presents a more serious matter. It is to the effect that my book is largely "a reconsideration and a rearrangement" of the work of others. I can meet this only with an affirmation: the statement is singularly unjust.

CHARLES A. BARKER

University of Maryland
December 16, 1941

THE MANAGING EDITOR OF THE JOURNAL OF SOUTHERN HISTORY:

Thank you very much for the opportunity of replying to Professor Barker's criticism of my review of his book. I do not care to answer it. My review has been made and I care neither to add to it nor take from it. Besides I dislike controversy very much.

HAYES BAKER-CROTHERS

Historical News and Notices

With this issue of the *Journal* a new Managing Editor assumes responsibility for presenting in printed form the contributions of scholars in the field of southern history. The shifting of names at the masthead hardly calls for an editorial, but the retiring Managing Editor cannot lay aside his responsibility without expressing appreciation to the members of the Association for their very generous co-operation in founding and maturing a magazine devoted to a long-neglected field. In so far as the *Journal* has attained recognition as a reputable historical periodical, the credit is not difficult to assign. Aside from financial support of the guarantor, it belongs mainly to those who have contributed meritorious articles, documents, and reviews; to members of the Board of Editors who have given generously of their time in policy forming and appraisal of manuscripts; and to the Editorial Associate whose long hours of laborious effort have contributed to consistency and accuracy of content, and whose keen, analytical criticism has promoted genuine scholarship. The former Managing Editor wishes for his successor a continuation of that co-operative effort that has given the *Journal* a high rank among historical magazines.

PERSONAL

Solon J. Buck, director of research and publications in The National Archives since 1935, became the second archivist of the United States on September 18. Before coming to The National Archives, Dr. Buck had been superintendent of the Minnesota Historical Society, 1914-1931, and director of the Western Pennsylvania Historical Survey, 1931-1935, and had served on the faculties of the universities of Indiana, Illinois, Minnesota, and Pittsburgh.

Among the honored guests at the semicentennial celebration of the establishment of the history, economics, and political science departments at the University of Missouri, December 6, were Jonas Viles and Jesse E. Wrench of the department of history.

Mose L. Harvey, assistant professor of history, Emory University, is on leave for the year 1941-1942 in order that he may participate in a research project dealing with postwar reconstruction, which is being sponsored by the Council on Foreign Relations. During his absence, his work will be carried on by J. Harvey Young.

Curtis Nunn, formerly of John Tarleton College, has gone to the Southwest Texas State Teachers' College. He was succeeded at Tarleton by Hamilton P. Easton. Joseph M. Nance is now teaching at the Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College, and John Stormont is a member of the history faculty at Schreiner Institute. Both of these men were formerly at the University of Texas. H. Bailey Carroll, former assistant to the director of the Texas State Historical Association, has returned to his position at North Texas Agricultural College. His place in the Historical Association has been taken by E. C. Barksdale.

R. D. W. Connor, University of North Carolina, was elected president of the Society of American Archivists at their annual meeting, October 6, 1941.

On September 20 C. C. Crittenden, representing the state of North Carolina, received from Michigan authorities two Civil War flags which had been captured during the conflict.

A. E. Van Dusen and J. B. Christopher are serving as instructors at Duke University in the places of Richard Watson, on leave in connection with the national defense program, and Mrs. Dorothy M. Quynn, on sabbatical leave.

James Westfall Thompson, president of the American Historical Association, 1941, and the Sidney Hellman Ehrman Professor Emeritus at the University of California, died September 30, 1941.

E. Wilson Lyon was inaugurated sixth president of Pomona College on October 18. Historians of southern California were present as invited guests of the college. The honorary degree of doctor of letters was conferred upon Bernadotte E. Schmitt, University of Chicago, who led a symposium on "The Terms of a Peace Settlement." Frank Pitman, John H. Gleason, John H. Kemble, and Chen Shou-Yi of the Pomona history department appeared on the program with Professor Schmitt.

At the meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science held in Dallas, December 29-31, G. W. McGinty, Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, read a paper on "The Negro Exodus from Louisiana, 1879-1881."

Weymouth T. Jordan, Judson College, was adjudged the winner of the McClung Award for 1941. The award is a cash prize of \$50 given annually by Mrs. C. M. McClung of Knoxville to the contributor of the best article in each issue of the East Tennessee Historical Society's *Publications*. Professor Jordan's contribution to the *Publications* (1941) is entitled "The Private Interests and Activities of George Washington Campbell." A. R. Newsome, University of North Carolina, Walter B. Posey, Birmingham-Southern College, and Francis P. Weisenburger, Ohio State University, were the judges.

Colonial Williamsburg, Incorporated, announces that it has awarded, through

its Department of Research and Record, seven fellowships to encourage the writing of studies of especial merit in the field of Virginia history during the year 1941-1942. The fellowships are also designed to promote the publication of studies in this field, and the awards are made upon the condition that the recipients shall submit the completed product of their researches for publication in the Williamsburg Restoration Historical Studies. The scope of the series has been defined as the history of Williamsburg, and the origin, development, and expansion of the civilization of which this city was a center.

The fellowships for the year 1941-1942 have been awarded to the persons listed below, with the studies upon which they are engaged: Willard F. Bliss, Princeton University, "The Extension of Tidewater Civilization into the Shenandoah Valley"; Wirt Armistead Cate, Nashville, Tennessee, "The Founding and Early Cultural Development of Richmond"; Joseph E. Charles, Harvard University, "The Party Origins of Jeffersonian Democracy"; Frank H. Colley, Duke University, "The Development of the Legal Profession in Colonial Virginia"; Calvin B. Coulter, Princeton University, "The Merchants of Colonial Virginia"; Adolph F. Meisen, University of North Carolina, "The Early Life of Thomas Jefferson"; David M. Potter, Rice Institute, "Governmental Offices of Colonial Virginia."

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

The North Carolina State Literary and Historical Association held its annual meeting at Raleigh, December 4-5. Two addresses given on the first day were "History through the Back Door," by Mrs. Marian Sims, Charlotte; and "Books and the World of the Future," by W. T. Couch, University of North Carolina Press. On the second day, Fletcher M. Green spoke on the Southern Collection at the University of North Carolina, and William T. Polk, Warrenton, reviewed North Carolina books and authors of the year. At the final meeting, announcement was made that the Mayflower Award for the best original literary work of the year by a resident North Carolinian should go to Wilbur J. Cash's *The Mind of the South*. Josephus Daniels, publisher of the *Raleigh News and Observer*, delivered an address, "The Good Neighbor Policy," which concluded the meeting.

The second annual meeting of the North Carolina Society for the Preservation of Antiquities was held at Raleigh, December 4. Addresses were made by Joseph H. Pratt, Chapel Hill, and Kenneth Chorley, New York City.

The three-hundred-nineteenth meeting of the Columbia Historical Society was held November 18, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington. An illustrated lecture entitled, "Washington—The Beautiful," was presented by Clarence A. Phillips.

The East Tennessee Historical Society met for its annual banquet in Knox-

ville, October 3. "The Preservation and Restoration of Historical Evidences Affected by TVA Activities in East Tennessee" was the theme of the program, with J. Charles Poe of the Tennessee Department of Conservation as the principal speaker. Representatives of the TVA, the D. A. R., the Colonial Dames, and the Knoxville Planning Commission discussed the possibility of restoring Bean Tavern, Fort Loudoun, Southwest Point, and historical buildings on the Knoxville water front. A motion was passed authorizing the Society to take the initiative in calling future meetings of representatives interested in restoring the various historic spots.

On September 30 the No Man's Land Historical Society met at the Panhandle Agricultural and Mechanical College, Goodwell, Oklahoma. Among those appearing on the program were Boss Neff, president of the Society; E. L. Morrison, president of the college at Goodwell; E. L. Hoover, Canadian, Texas; H. G. Bennett, president of the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College; and James W. Moffitt, Oklahoma Historical Society. The No Man's Land Historical Society maintains an excellent museum.

A program was held at the statue of the Pioneer Women at Ponca City, Oklahoma, September 16, 1941. Those taking part in the program were Leon C. Phillips, governor of Oklahoma, and representatives of several historical societies and agencies as follows: Grant Foreman, New Mexico Historical Society; Dallas T. Herndon, Arkansas History Commission; R. E. Spencer, Iowa Department of Archives and History; T. E. Beck, State Historical Society of Kansas; Frank Phillips, State Historical Society of Iowa; and James W. Moffitt, Oklahoma Historical Society.

The formation of the Creek County Historical Society, October 12, the Garfield County Historical Society, October 28, and the Stephens County Historical Society, November 24, indicates the enthusiasm for study of local history in Oklahoma. Plans have been made for these and similar organizations in the state to collect interviews with pioneers, early letters, newspapers, maps, and other historical data.

At the regular monthly meeting of the Filson Club, December 1, Allen M. Reager, Louisville, read a paper on "George Rogers Clark—A Mason," and Hambleton Tapp, Louisville, made a preliminary report on the work that has been done by the Committee on the George Rogers Clark Memorial Movement.

During the academic year 1940-1941 there were three luncheons to which historical writers and professors of history in and near Washington, D. C., were invited. The interest in such gatherings has increased, and on November 16, seventy-five persons were present at a luncheon. For the first year, W. H. Gewehr, University of Maryland, served as chairman; and for the present aca-

demic year, 1941-1942, Percy S. Flippin, The National Archives, is serving in that position.

Two regional meetings of the Texas State Historical Association were held in November. The first, at Waco, November 15, 1941, heard the following program: "The Importance of Waco and Its Area Historically," by K. H. Aynesworth; "Huaco or Hueco or Waco," by Clint Padgitt; "Waco Spring and the Old Suspension Bridge," by Judge William Sleeper; "Early Legal Talent," by Judge Allan D. Sanford; "The Sixshooter in Waco," by Judge J. D. Williamson; "Development of Local History Interest by Schools," by R. H. Brister; and "Work of the Texas State Historical Association," by Walter P. Webb. The second meeting, which was held at Houston, November 21, honored the San Jacinto Museum of History. Among the speeches presented were: "The Local Community: The Beginning Historian's Laboratory," by George W. Hill; "The San Jacinto Museum of History: An Adventure in Texana," by Ike Moore; "Family Notes by Request," by Mrs. Hally Bryan Perry; and "A Program for Texas," by Walter P. Webb.

Each year a site of historical interest is visited by the members of the National Society of Colonial Dames of America in Oklahoma. On November 17 the meeting was held at Fort Sill. Mrs. Myron E. Humphrey, Chickasha, outlined the history of the fort, and Mrs. Frank M. Bailey gave some personal reminiscences connected with it. The program was followed by a tour of the historical buildings at the site.

A service for thanksgiving and dedication on the occasion of the hundredth anniversary of the founding of the city of Dallas was held in the Hall of Six Flags, Hall of State, Dallas, Texas, November 23, 1941. The Dallas Historical Society was largely responsible for the successful program.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

The Committee on Historical Source Materials of the American Historical Association is undertaking a survey of all projects in progress or completed for the indexing, digesting, microfilming, etc., of newspapers. Anyone knowing of such efforts to preserve files or to facilitate the use of newspapers is asked to communicate with Culver H. Smith, University of Chattanooga, who is chairman of the subcommittee on newspapers. Undertakings that have failed, as well as those that have succeeded, should be reported.

The Mississippi Valley Press, established in 1939 at Oxford, Ohio, by Philip D. Jordan, Miami University, and Charles M. Thomas, Ohio State University, has published the following books during the past year: *Heaven on Earth, A Planned Mormon Society*, by William J. McNiff; *Quaker Lady, The Story of Charity Lynch*, by Alta Harvey Heiser; *Lasare Carnot, Republican Patriot*, by

J. Huntley Dupre; *The Civil War Veteran in Minnesota Life and Politics*, by Frank H. Heck; and *Hamilton in the Making*, by Alta Harvey Heiser. The function of this Press has been to provide a publishing service in which the overhead costs are restricted to the level justifiable for books of less popular appeal. It is believed that this specialization has made possible the printing of books in excellent form at less subsidy than the amount ordinarily required for such works.

The Correspondence between Benjamin Harrison and James G. Blaine, 1883-1893 (Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society, 1940, pp. xii, 314, illustrations, index, \$3.50), collected and edited by Albert T. Volwiler, makes accessible material of immeasurable value to students of the period. The editor has written an interpretative introduction which adds much to the volume. In the correspondence may be noted the transition from warm friendship to bitter rivalry between the two Republican leaders, whose greatly differing personalities and abilities are apparent. Causes for the breach between the two ranking officials of the country are also traceable. The effects of Blaine's increasingly poor health and a series of personal sorrows are evident.

Handbook for Translators of Spanish Historical Documents (Austin: Archives Collection, University of Texas, 1941, pp. viii, 198, \$1.50), by J. Villasana Haggard, assisted by Malcolm D. McLean, is a trial issue which has grown out of the extensive experience of Mr. Haggard and others in transcribing historical documents. Its objectives are to provide a guide that may help translators to avoid errors and "to standardize the translation and transcription of Spanish historical documents." The authors have made a contribution of extraordinary worth. If persons who have struggled with some of the problems considered in this work will co-operate with the authors by offering suggestions derived from their own experience, the next edition of the *Handbook* will have a secure place as an indispensable tool for all who work with Spanish historical documents.

The Small Loan Problem of the Carolinas, With a Commentary on Regulation in Virginia (Clinton, S. C.: Presbyterian College Press, 1941, pp. 154, bibliography, appendices, \$2.00), by William Hays Simpson, is an analytical, descriptive, and statistical study of the operation of the small-loan process in North and South Carolina. In addition to a treatment of Carolina borrowers and the cost of their loans, a description of the small-loan offices and other lending agencies, and efforts to pass control legislation, the author discusses the methods of regulation in other states, with particular attention to the control devices of Virginia.

Sidney Lanier, Poet and Prosodist (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1941, pp. xvii, 108, \$2.00), by Richard Webb and Edwin R. Coulson, consists

of two essays, "Sidney Lanier, Poet and Prosodist," written by Mr. Webb as a graduate student at Yale University in 1903, and "Lanier's Place as American Poet and Prosodist," by Mr. Coulson.

"The Story of Kentucky," published by the Louisville *Courier-Journal* in January, 1942, has six sections filled with interesting material on the state which, in 1792, was the second admitted to the Union. Illustrated biographical sketches of persons born in Kentucky, or born elsewhere and prominent in Kentucky, are of interest. In most instances these contributions were chosen from longer studies of the individuals or were written by authorities about single, picturesque features of the lives of prominent men and women. Included in what might be called the Hall of Fame for "The Story of Kentucky," are: Daniel Boone, John Filson, Richard Henderson, George Rogers Clark, Isaac Shelby, Henry Clay, Cassius Clay, Zachary Taylor, Abraham Lincoln, Mary Todd Lincoln, Jefferson Davis, Simon Bolivar Buckner, John C. Breckinridge, James Guthrie, Dr. Ephraim McDowell, William Goebel, "Marse" Henry Waterson, Samuel Miller, John Marshall Harlan, and Louis Brandeis.

Descriptions of scenery, of industries and resources, of schools and churches, of contributions to the nation's fighting forces, of artistic and literary developments, and of folkways make this sesquicentennial edition of the newspaper a guide which will add to a tourist's enjoyment of the new, as well as to a resident's pleasure in the familiar, in Kentucky. Short articles on the Indians, the origin of the name of the state, the customs and problems of the early settlers, and the population changes in the state are included.

Two other short contributions worthy of mention are the article summarizing events important in 1792 other than the admission of Kentucky into the Union, and the one forecasting life in Kentucky in 2092, when a new anniversary edition of the Louisville *Courier-Journal* will seem to be appropriate.

On December 15 the University of Texas received the bequest of the Philpott Collection of Texana. Half the cost of \$25,000 for this collection was given by Miss Blanche McKie of Corsicana. It includes Texas books, pamphlets, booklets, maps, and magazines; approximately fifty prints, including at least six by Champ d'Asile, one engraving of David Crockett, and two engravings of Sam Houston; and a number of Mexican books.

It was noted in the February, 1941, issue of the *Journal* that the number of Survey of Federal Archives and Historical Records Survey publications was growing so large that it would be impossible to do more than note the initiation of a new series, or the completion of major series. It may be noted that a revision of *A Bibliography of Research Projects Reports Check List of Historical Records Survey Publications* has been issued. Two small but very useful volumes released recently in the *Inventory of the State Archives of Louisiana Series II. The Judiciary*, are: No. 2. *The Supreme Court of Louisiana* (University: Depart-

ment of Archives, Louisiana State University, pp. 59), and No. 3. *The Courts of Appeal* (University: Department of Archives, Louisiana State University, pp. 100). During the summer *A Check List of Texas Newspapers* prepared by the Early American Imprints unit of the Historical Records Survey and State Library Project of Texas was released. The Louisiana list is entitled *Louisiana Newspapers, 1794-1940: A Union List of Louisiana Newspaper Files Available in Offices of Publishers, Libraries and Private Collections in Louisiana*. This list was released in September. The church archives inventory was initiated in Louisiana recently with a *Directory of Churches and Religious Organizations in New Orleans* (University: Department of Archives, Louisiana State University, pp. 98), and an *Inventory of the Church and Synagogue Archives of Louisiana Jewish Congregations and Organizations*. The Historical Records Survey's "Guide to Depositories of Manuscript Collections in Louisiana," was published in April, 1941, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly*, XXIV, 305-53. A second edition in mimeographed form was distributed in January, 1942. The first of the Louisiana municipal archives inventory series was released in April; it indicates the form these volumes will take in that state. The inventory covers the records of Franklinton, seat of Washington Parish. Attention previously has been called to the mimeographed *Transcriptions of Parish Records of Louisiana, Series I. Police Jury Minutes* for Jefferson and Iberville parishes. Since that time, three of the six volumes of the St. Bernard Parish series have been mimeographed. Typed copies of Police Jury Minutes for the following parishes have been deposited with the Library of Congress, the Louisiana State University Department of Archives, Tulane's Howard-Tilton Memorial Library, the Louisiana State Museum Library, and the respective police juries by the Historical Records Survey: Bienville Parish, 1856-1939, 6 vols.; LaSalle Parish, 1908-1938, 4 vols.; Lincoln Parish, 1877-1940, 6 vols.; Webster Parish, 1874-1940, 7 vols.; Winn Parish, 1880-1939, 4 vols.

The list of mimeographed publications of the Louisiana Survey of Federal Archives Project is available in *A Bibliography of Research Projects Reports* mentioned above. One series has been initiated on this survey project, viz., *Ship Registers and Enrollments of New Orleans, Louisiana*, the first volume of which (1804-1820) was distributed in August.

The Department of Archives, Louisiana State University, has accessioned twenty-six groups of manuscripts in the past six months. Among the more noteworthy of these is the Bieller-Snyder Papers, 3,229 items and 6 volumes, covering the period 1800-1872. The papers relating to the Bieller family include the personal correspondence of Joseph Bieller, a planter of Rodney, Mississippi, and his son, Jacob Bieller, who owned a plantation on Bayou Mason, Louisiana. The items after about 1830 are chiefly those of Alonzo Snyder, a lawyer of Rodney. Business and legal matters predominate, and a series of letters from va-

rious factorages in New Orleans are included. The Newell (Robert A.) Papers, 1841-1887, center about the period of the Civil War and contain letters written from Texas, where the family emigrated to avoid capture when the Federal troops occupied their plantation, Elm Bayou, near Cheneyville. Other Texas letters are those of Newell to his wife from various towns while he was employed by the Nitre and Mining Company, subsequently the Nitre and Mining Bureau. There are 239 items, mainly the personal papers of Robert Aiken Newell with some legal documents, business receipts, and 11 daguerreotypes of members of the Newell and Forman families. The Hatcher (William B.) Collection consists of photostats of papers pertaining to Edward Livingston, which were gathered by Professor Hatcher in the preparation of his biography of Livingston. Two additional groups of Markham family papers have been received including the Markham (Thomas R.) Papers (C), approximately 500 items and 10 volumes comprised chiefly of the notes and sermons of the Reverend Thomas R. Markham. Sixteen account books of the plantation and store at Peach Grove compose the McCarstle (C. and Theodore) Papers (B). The Magruder (Eliza L.) Diary, 1846-1850, reveals the incidents of plantation life in the Natchez region and gives information on the Dunbar, Magruder, and Turpin families. The West Indies Collection (B) contains a file of letters and petitions (copies), 1728-1738, relating to conflicts between the English and Spanish governments and especially the claims of English subjects against Spanish depredations upon their commerce with the colonies in America and in the West Indies. There is also a diary of a staff officer on the islands of Martinique and Grenada, January-March, 1795. Pamphlets, newspapers, newspaper clippings, and letters constitute another group supplementing the Ellis (E. John, Thomas C. W., and Family) Papers. Two diaries, the Clark (R. S.) Diary (copy) and the Bateman (Mary) Diary (copy), two notebooks, the Rapalje (George) Notebook and the Armstrong (A.) Notebook, and the Minnich (J. W.) Papers are among the more important groups.

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

- "The Origin of the Ring Tournament in the United States," by G. Harrison Orians, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (September).
"Reading Interests of the Professional Classes in Colonial Maryland, 1700-1776," continued, by Joseph T. Wheeler, *ibid.*
"The Warden Papers," continued, by William D. Hoyt, Jr., *ibid.*
"Politics in Maryland during the Civil War," continued, by Charles B. Clark, *ibid.* (September, December).
"Poe in Amity Street," by May Garrettson Evans, *ibid.* (December).
"The Maryland Germans in the Civil War," by Dieter Cunz, *ibid.*
"William Faris, 1728-1804, Silversmith, Clock and Watch Maker of Annapolis, Md.," by Lockwood Barr, *ibid.*

- "The Makers of West Virginia," by C. H. Ambler, in *West Virginia History* (July).
- "An Historic Iroquois Site Near Romney, West Virginia," by Carl Manson and Howard MacCord, *ibid.*
- "Some Other Successful West Virginians," by Carrol H. Quenzel, *ibid.* (October).
- "Methodism in West Virginia, 1800-1825," by Virgil A. Lewis, *ibid.*
- "Captain Robert Stobo," concluded, by George M. Kahrl, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (July).
- "The Buffaloe Settlement and Its Makers," continued, by Joseph D. Eggleston, *ibid.* (July, October).
- "The Iron-Clad *Virginia*," by T. Catesby Jones, *ibid.* (October).
- "Some Notes on the Mordecai Family," by Ruth K. Nuernberger, *ibid.*
- "Glassmaking in Virginia, 1607-1625," II, by Charles E. Hatch, Jr., in the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (July).
- "The Six Earliest Churches on the Eastern Shore of Virginia," by George C. Mason, *ibid.*
- "Exploration in Mass Emancipation," by William B. McGroarty, *ibid.*
- "His Dearest Daughter's Names," by Charles E. Gilliam, *ibid.*
- "A Note on the Influence of Oxford University Upon William and Mary College in the Eighteenth Century," by Courtlandt Canby, *ibid.*
- "Werowocomico," by Alfred Bagby, Jr., *ibid.*
- "Poe's Mother: With a Note on John Allan," by Jay B. Hubbell, *ibid.*
- "The Moore House: A National Shrine," by Charles E. Hatch, Jr., *ibid.* (October).
- "Revolutionary War Discharges," by Alexander W. Armour, *ibid.*
- "The Colonial Churches of Warwick and Elizabeth City Counties," by George C. Mason, *ibid.*
- "Frontier Fortifications along the Virginia Fall Line," by William N. Davis, Jr., in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (July).
- "Bacon's Rebellion," by Lyon G. Tyler, *ibid.*
- "Excommunication, Virginia Style," by Joseph C. Robert, in the *South Atlantic Quarterly* (July).
- "Pocahontas and Jamestown," by Louise Phelps Kellogg, in the *Wisconsin Magazine of History* (September).
- "Debtor Relief in North Carolina During Reconstruction," by Kenneth E. St. Clair, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (July).
- "Flora MacDonald in History," by Dorothy M. Quynn, *ibid.*
- "The Democratic Societies of the Carolinas," by Eugene P. Link, *ibid.*
- "Governor Vance and the End of the War in North Carolina," by Richard E. Yates, *ibid.* (October).

- "Political Disturbances in Colonial Granville County," by Nannie M. Tilley, *ibid.*
- "The Political Ideas of George Nicholas," by Huntley Dupre, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (July).
- "Col. Theodore O'Hara," by Sidney Herbert, *ibid.*
- "Ancestral Shades—," by Charles R. Staples, *ibid.* (October).
- "Education in the Early Days of Kentucky," by May Stone, *ibid.*
- "George Rogers Clark, a Biographical Sketch," by Hambleton Tapp, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (July).
- "After the Death of George Rogers Clark," by R. C. Ballard Thruston, *ibid.*
- "A George Rogers Clark Memorial in Kentucky," by Hambleton Tapp, *ibid.*
- "Daniel Boone and the Kentucky Character in 1855—A Letter from America, by Leo Lesquereux," translated by Joseph B. Rivlin, *ibid.* (October).
- "The Military Career of Captain James Shelby, Brother of Governor Isaac Shelby of Kentucky," by Samuel C. Williams, *ibid.*
- "Boone Family Reminiscences as Told to Mrs. Dye," by Eva Emery Dye, in the *Oregon Historical Quarterly* (October).
- "A Revolutionary Frontiersman," by Edgar F. Shannon, Jr., in the *South Atlantic Quarterly* (October).
- "The Founding of Knoxville," by Stanley J. Folmsbee and Lucile Deaderick, in the East Tennessee Historical Society's *Publications* (1941).
- "The Covenanters Come to Tennessee," by Theron Alexander, Jr., *ibid.*
- "The Private Interests and Activities of George Washington Campbell," by Weymouth T. Jordan, *ibid.*
- "The Origin of the Republican Party in East Tennessee," by Verton M. Queener, *ibid.*
- "The Historical Records Survey in Tennessee: A Review of Five Years," by the Tennessee Historical Records Survey, *ibid.*
- "The School Law of 1853, Its Origin and Authors," by Howard I. McKee, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (July).
- "The Iron Industry of Missouri," continued, by Arthur B. Cozzens, *ibid.* (July, October).
- "They Came From Missouri and They Showed the World," by Irving Dilliard, *ibid.* (October).
- "The Building of the Hannibal and St. Joseph Railroad," by Homer Clevenger, *ibid.*
- "The French of Old Missouri (1804-1821): A Study in Assimilation," by Harvey Wish, in *Mid-America* (July).
- "Tams Bixby, 1855-1922," by Robert L. Williams, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (September).
- "Chief Benjamin Franklin Smallwood and Chief Jefferson Gardner," by John B. Meserve, *ibid.*

"George Buchanan Noble, 1866-1940," by Robert L. Williams, *ibid.*

"General Bennet Riley, Commandant at Fort Gibson and Governor of California," by Carolyn T. Foreman, *ibid.*

"'Friends' among the Seminole," by Alexander Spoehr, *ibid.*

"Oklahoma Oil and Indian Land Tenure," by Gerald Forbes, in *Agricultural History* (October).

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

"Robert Goldsborough of Ashby, and His Six Sons," edited by Roberta B. Henry, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (September).

"Letters of Charles Carroll, Barrister," continued, *ibid.*

"Joshua Barney and the French Revolution," by Bernard Mayo, *ibid.* (December).

"West Virginians in the American Revolution," continued, assembled and edited by Ross B. Johnston, in *West Virginia History* (July, October).

"West Virginia Forty-Niners," edited by C. H. Ambler, *ibid.* (October).

"Letters of John Randolph, of Roanoke, to General Thomas Marsh Forman," in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (July).

"War's Wild Alarm," *ibid.*

"Minute Book of the Buffalo Circulating Library," continued, edited by Joseph D. Eggleston, *ibid.* (July, October).

"William Byrd 'Title Book,'" continued, edited and annotated by Mrs. Rebecca Johnston, *ibid.*

"Virginia Militia Officers, 1698," contributed by George H. S. King, *ibid.* (October).

"The Bachelors of Virginia Thank Lieutenant-Governor Nicholson," edited by Charles F. Mullett, *ibid.*

"Purchasers of Salt in Old Dunmore County, Virginia, 1776," edited by William T. Williams, *ibid.*

"Mr. Cabell, Mr. Warden, and the University, 1823," edited by William D. Hoyt, Jr., *ibid.*

"Copies of Extant Wills from Counties Whose Records Have Been Destroyed," continued, by George H. S. King, in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (July).

"The Westward Migration of a Planter Pioneer in 1796," edited by Bayrd Still, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (October).

"Sir Henry Clinton's Review of Simcoe's *Journal*," edited by Howard H. Peckham, *ibid.*

"Essex County: An Annotated Copy of the Rent Roll of 1704," edited by John B. C. Nicklin, *ibid.*

"A Ring Tournament in 1864: A Letter From a Mississippian in the Army of

- Northern Virginia," edited by Joseph C. Robert, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (October).
- "Reconstruction Letters from North Carolina," II, "Letters to John Sherman," concluded, edited by James A. Padgett, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (July, October); III, "Letters to William Tecumseh Sherman," edited by *id.*, *ibid.* (October); IV, "Letters to Elihu Benjamin Washburne," edited by *id.*, *ibid.*
- "Diary of the Wilderness Road in the Year 1816," by James Walker, edited by Emma Parkes Watts, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (July).
- "Early Marriage Records of Madison County, Ky.," concluded, compiled by W. Rodes Shackelford, *ibid.*
- "Kentucky Marriages and Obituaries," continued, compiled and edited by G. Glenn Clift, *ibid.* (July, October).
- "The Letters of Colonel Richard M. Johnson of Kentucky," continued, edited by James A. Padgett, *ibid.*
- "Lincoln County Wills and Inventories," *ibid.* (October).
- "Frankfort, Kentucky, Newspapers," compiled by Bayless Hardin, *ibid.*
- "John D. Shane's Interview with Colonel John Graves of Fayette County," transcribed by Otto A. Rothert, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (October).
- "Papers from the Spanish Archives Relating to Tennessee and the Old Southwest, 1783-1800," V, translated and edited by D. C. Corbitt and Roberta Corbitt, in the East Tennessee Historical Society's *Publications* (1941).
- "Writings on Tennessee History, 1940," compiled by Laura E. Luttrell, *ibid.*
- "Notes from *The Northern Standard*, 1842-1849," continued, edited by James D. Morrison, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (September).

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

- "South Carolina's Decision to Lead the Secession Movement," by Charles E. Cauthen, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (October).
- "The Origin and Growth of the Free Negro Population of Charleston, South Carolina," by E. Horace Fitchett, in the *Journal of Negro History* (October).
- "Some New Light on the Bosomworth Claims," by John P. Corry, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (September).
- "Colerain Plantation," IV, by Savannah Unit, Georgia Writers' Project, WPA, *ibid.*
- "Whitehall Plantation," I, by *id.*, *ibid.* (December).
- "The Political and Civil Status of Women in Georgia, 1783-1860," by Eleanor M. Boatwright, *ibid.*
- "Dr. William Houstoun, Botanist," by Edith D. Johnston, *ibid.*

- "Georgia's Confederate Dead in the Frederick, Maryland Cemetery," by George T. Ness, Jr., *ibid.*
- "Ponce de León's Fountain of Youth: History of a Geographical Myth," by Leonardo Olschki, in the *Hispanic American Historical Review* (August).
- "St. Augustine Under the British Flag, 1763-1775," by Charles L. Mowat, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (October).
- "Spanish Fortifications of Pensacola, 1698-1763," by Stanley Faye, *ibid.*
- "Samuel A. Swann and the Development of Florida, 1855-1900," by Helen R. Sharp, *ibid.*
- "Passing of the Old Montgomery Theatre," by Frank P. O'Brien, in the *Alabama Historical Quarterly* (Spring).
- "Chickasaw and Earlier Indian Cultures of Northeast Mississippi," by Jesse D. Jennings, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (July).
- "Jefferson College and Education in Mississippi, 1798-1817," by William B. Hamilton, *ibid.* (October).
- "Plantation Life in Central Mississippi As Revealed In the Clay Sharkey Papers," by George C. Osborn, *ibid.*
- "The Home Life of a Plantation Statesman, John Sharp Williams," by *id.*, in *Agricultural History* (July).
- "Ante-Bellum New Orleans as an Agricultural Focus," by Wendell H. Stephenson, *ibid.* (October).
- "Recruiting in Old Orleans for New Orleans," by Dorothy M. Quynn, in the *American Historical Review* (July).
- "L'Enfance et la Jeunesse de Pierre Le Moyne, Sieur d'Iberville," by Guy Frégault, in *Mid-America* (July).
- "Pénicaut and His Chronicle of Early Louisiana," by Elizabeth McCann, *ibid.* (October).
- "Contraband Trade Between Louisiana and New Mexico in the Eighteenth Century," by Henri Folmer, in the *New Mexico Historical Review* (July).
- "Commodore Aury," by Stanley Faye, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (July).
- "Edward Livingston's View of the Nature of the Union," by William B. Hatcher, *ibid.*
- "Louisiana Linguistic and Folklore Backgrounds," by André Lafargue, *ibid.*
- "Pistols for Two, Coffee for One," by John S. Kendall, *ibid.*
- "The Red River Raft," by Norman W. Caldwell, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (September).
- "The Life of Colonel R. T. Milner," concluded, by Rosalind Langston, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (July).
- "The Laredo City Election and Riot of April, 1886," by Seb. S. Wilcox, *ibid.*
- "Norwegian Settlements in Texas," by Axel Arneson, *ibid.* (October).

"Count Alphonso de Saligny and the Franco-Texienne Bill," by Bernice B. Denton, *ibid.*

"The Last 'Crusade' of Mirabeau B. Lamar," by Sister M. Baptista Roach, *ibid.*

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

"Philip Freneau in Charleston," by Lewis Leary, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (July).

"Poinsett-Campbell Correspondence," continued, edited by Samuel G. Stoney, *ibid.* (July, October).

"The Journal of John Blake White," continued, edited by Paul R. Weidner, *ibid.*

"Marriage and Death Notices from the City Gazette of Charleston, S. C.," continued, contributed by Elizabeth H. Jervey, *ibid.*

"Journal of General Peter Horry," continued, *ibid.*

"Abstracts from the Records of the Court of Ordinary, 1764-1771," continued, contributed by Mabel L. Webber, *ibid.*

"A Report from the Continental General Hospital in 1780," contributed by Joseph I. Waring, *ibid.* (October).

"Early Generations of the Legaré Family in South Carolina," in *Transactions of the Huguenot Society of South Carolina* (1941).

"Wills of Huguenot Ancestors of South Carolina Families," edited by Katherine B. Mazýck, *ibid.*

"Old Canoochee Backwoods Sketches," XV, by Julia E. Harn, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (September).

"The Campaign from Chattanooga to Atlanta as Seen by a Federal Soldier," edited by Richard B. Harwell, *ibid.*

"Letters of Three Lightfoot Brothers, 1861-1864," I, edited by Edmund C. Burnett, *ibid.* (December).

"A Letter from Indian Key, 1840," in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (October).

"From a Remote Frontier: Letters and Documents Passing Between John Stuart, Superintendent of Indian Affairs, and Captain Harries in Command at Apalache (St. Marks), and General Gage, Their Commander in Chief at New York, September, 1764," continued, edited by Mark F. Boyd, *ibid.*

"Colonel John McKee," in the *Alabama Historical Quarterly* (Spring).

"Regulations Governing Student Life at the Judson Female Institute During the Decade Preceding the Civil War," edited by A. Elizabeth Taylor, *ibid.*

"Madam Le Vert's Diary," *ibid.*

"Towns in the Alabama Territory," *ibid.*

"History of Autauga County," by John Hardy, *ibid.*

"Martin Marshall's Book: Homemade Medicine," continued, edited by Weymouth T. Jordan, *ibid.*

- "Three Letters of Richard Claiborne to William Miller, 1816-1818," edited by Walter Prichard, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (July).
- "Records of the Superior Council of Louisiana, January-March, 1763," LXXXVIII, edited by G. Lugano, revised by Walter Prichard, *ibid.*; April-May, 1763, LXXXIX, *ibid.* (October).
- "Index to the Spanish Judicial Records of Louisiana, August, 1784," LXX, by Laura L. Porteous, marginal notes by Walter Prichard, *ibid.* (July); September, 1784, LXXI, *ibid.* (October).
- "Texas County Histories," continued, compiled by H. Bailey Carroll, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (July, October).
- "Spain's Indian Policy in Texas: Translations from the B  xar Archives," continued, edited by J. Villasana Haggard, *ibid.* (October).

GENERAL AND REGIONAL ARTICLES, DOCUMENTS, AND COMPILATIONS

- "French and Other Intrigues in the Southwest Territory, 1790-96," by Samuel C. Williams, in the East Tennessee Historical Society's *Publications* (1941).
- "Judge Tourg  e and Reconstruction," by Russel B. Nye, in the *Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* (April-June).
- "The 'De Soto Map,'" by Barbara Boston, in *Mid-America* (July).
- "Non-Economic Factors in the Frontier Movement," by Gilbert J. Garraghan, *ibid.* (October).
- "The Role of Education in the Maryland Colonization Movement," by Charles A. Earp, in the *Journal of Negro History* (July).
- "Militant Abolitionism," by Herbert Aptheker, *ibid.* (October).
- "Washington and the Whiskey Insurrection," by Bennett M. Rich, in the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (July).
- "Lincoln Was Tough on Officers," by Don Russell, in the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* (September).
- "The Raising of Union Forces in Illinois During the Civil War," by Aretas A. Dayton, *ibid.* (December).
- "The Knights of the Golden Circle, The Career of George Bickley," by Ollinger Crenshaw, in the *American Historical Review* (October).
- "Who elected Lincoln?" by Joseph Schafer, *ibid.*
- "Ephraim Beanland and Zenon of Caunus, A Historical Comparison," by W. L. Westermann, *ibid.*
- "Post Bellum Reconstruction, An American Experience," by Alfred Holt Stone, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (July).
- "Walter Scott, Mark Twain, and the Civil War," by G. Harrison Orians, in the *South Atlantic Quarterly* (October).
- "The Farm Journals, Their Editors, and Their Public, 1830-1860," by A. L. Demaree, in *Agricultural History* (October).

- "General Rufus King and the Capture of John H. Surratt," by Duane Koenig, in the *Wisconsin Magazine of History* (September).
- "Our National Guard: An Introduction to Its History," continued, by Frederick P. Todd, in *Military Affairs* (Summer, Fall).
- "What Should Our Historical Society Do?" by Edward P. Alexander, in the *Bulletins of the American Association for State and Local History* (October).
- "The Origins of the War of 1812, a Survey of Changing Interpretations," by Warren H. Goodman, in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (September).
- "Some Jefferson Letters," edited by Sigmund Diamond, *ibid.*
- "The Appointment of L. Q. C. Lamar to the Supreme Court," by Willie D. Halsell, *ibid.* (December).
- "Ulrich Bonnell Phillips—The South's Foremost Historian," in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (September).
- "Letters of James Brown to Henry Clay, 1804-1835," edited by James A. Padgett, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (October).

CONTRIBUTORS

B. B. KENDRICK is professor of history at the Woman's College of the University of North Carolina.

HAYES BAKER-CROTHERS is professor of history at the University of Maryland.

RUTH ALLISON HUDNUT (Mrs. Hayes Baker-Crothers) is collaborator with her husband in historical research.

THOMAS D. CLARK is associate professor of history at the University of Kentucky.

JAMES W. PATTON is professor of history at Converse College.

JAMES C. MALIN is professor of history at the University of Kansas.

FELIX GILBERT is a member of the Institute for Advanced Study, School of Economics and Politics, Princeton University.

South America and Hemisphere Defense

BY J. FRED RIPPY

PROFESSOR OF LATIN AMERICAN HISTORY
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

J. Fred Rippy has condensed into this crisply-written volume the essential features of the American system as it has evolved in both continents and has suggested the course we must follow along cultural, political, and socioeconomic lines in order to preserve and strengthen the American heritage. A book for all who are interested in the other nations of this hemisphere.

"Replete with facts, admirably objective. it offers to the serious reader more reliable information than many more voluminous and pretentious contributions on the subject." **The Nation**

". . . a useful introduction to any consideration of the continued inclusion of the South American countries in the American system." **The Library Journal**

"Probably no other professor of Latin American history is better informed by repeated visits, personal contact, and intensive study, concerning our inter-American relations." **The Nashville Banner**

CLOTH. XII, 101 PAGES. 8v°.

\$1.50

Louisiana State University Press

UNIVERSITY STATION

BATON ROUGE, LA.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN EUROPE

By Clive Day

This well-written book makes clear the vital processes of economic development as well as the essential facts in European economic history. It shows the close relationship between economic, social and political history and between the various facts of economic history proper. It gives a detailed account of the development of fundamental economic institutions in England from 1086 to 1939; explains the significant elements in the economic history of other European countries; and shows the factors in their economic development which led to the conditions existing at the outbreak of the present war.

Revised Edition

\$4.00 Probable

The MACMILLAN COMPANY

60 FIFTH AVENUE

NEW YORK

Announcing

LOUISIANA IN THE CONFEDERACY

By JEFFERSON DAVIS BRAGG

"A study of the politics, economics, and military history of the state of Louisiana from 1860 until the resignation of Governor Allen in 1865. This is a well-documented account of a trying time in the state's history, valuable to any student of the Civil War."

The Library Journal

IX, 341 PAGES. CLOTH. OCTAVO.

\$3.00

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS
BATON ROUGE

THE HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

A quarterly dealing with the history of the
Latin American countries

JOHN TATE LANNING }
ALAN K. MANCHESTER } EDITORS

Contents of the November (1941) Issue

FRENCH INTEREST IN THE SPANISH EMPIRE DURING THE
MINISTRY OF THE DUC DE CHOISEUL, 1759-1771 Allan Christelow

METTERNICH'S ATTITUDE TOWARD REVOLUTIONS IN LATIN
AMERICA William Spence Robertson

SPANISH-MEXICAN DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS, 1853-
1855 Richard A. Johnson

CHURCH AND STATE IN COLUMBIA AS OBSERVED BY AMER-
ICAN DIPLOMATS, 1834-1906 Carey Shaw, Jr.

BOOK REVIEWS

DOCUMENTS

NOTES AND COMMENT

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SECTION

SUBSCRIPTION: \$4.00 A YEAR

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Durham, N. C.

AGRICULTURAL HISTORY

Designed as a medium for the publication of research and documents per-
taining to the history of agriculture in all its phases and as a clearing house
for information of interest and value to workers in the field. Materials on the
history of agriculture in all countries are included and also material on insti-
tutions, organizations, and sciences which have been factors in agricultural
development.

ISSUED QUARTERLY SINCE 1927

BY

THE AGRICULTURAL HISTORY SOCIETY

Subscriptions, including membership: Regular, \$3.00; Student, \$1.50;
Contributing, \$1.00; Life, \$100 less age of applicant on last birthday.

Editor:
EVERETT E. EDWARDS

Secretary-Treasurer:
ARTHUR G. PETERSON

ROOM 3901, SOUTH BUILDING, 13TH AND C STREETS SW
WASHINGTON, D. C.

WILLIAMSBURG RESTORATION HISTORICAL STUDIES

General Editor: Hunter Dickinson Farish

Advisory Board: Thomas Jefferson Wertenbaker, chairman, Charles McLean Andrews, Virginius Dabney, Samuel Eliot Morison, Richard Lee Morton, Arthur Meier Schlesinger, Earl Gregg Swem

Number 1

THE PRESENT STATE OF VIRGINIA AND THE COLLEGE

By Hartwell, Blair, and Chilton

Edited, with an introduction, by H. D. Farish

"... The work is particularly valuable for the insight which it gives into the actual operation of the colonial government at the end of the seventeenth century."—Thomas Perkins Abernethy, *Mississippi Valley Historical Review*. "... A valuable piece of Americana."—*Newsweek*. \$2.75

Number 2

ROBERT CARTER OF NOMINI HALL: A VIRGINIA TOBACCO PLANTER OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

By Louis Morton

"... Dr. Morton has presented us with a full-length study of the master of Nomini Hall, Councillor Robert Carter. The justification for this study lies ... in the degree to which his career illuminates the social and economic history of Virginia during the second half of the eighteenth century."—Henry Steele Commager, *New York Herald Tribune*. On *The Nation's* list of "Best Books of the Year" for 1941. \$3.50

Published by

Colonial Williamsburg, Incorporated
WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA

Sales Agent: Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey

The Pacific Historical Review

Issued by the
Pacific Coast Branch
of the

American Historical Association

Articles, documents, book reviews, comments
and historical news on the entire Pacific area

BOARD OF EDITORS

Managing Editor: LOUIS KNOTT KOONTZ

Associate Editor: JOHN W. CAUGHEY

HAROLD W. BRADLEY

CHARLES B. FAHS

DAN E. CLARK

GEORGE P. HAMMOND

PETER M. DUNNE, S.J.

WALTER N. SAGE

Published in March, June, September, and December

Subscription rates: \$4.00 a year;

Canada, \$4.25; other countries, \$4.50

SPECIAL RATES TO STUDENTS

A sample copy will be sent on request

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

William and Mary College Quarterly

Devoted to the publication of original
contributions and documents
relating to Virginia history

\$1.00 A COPY \$4.00 A YEAR

THOROUGHLY INDEXED

Published Quarterly by
William and Mary College
at WILLIAMSBURG, VIRGINIA

Editors

JOHN STEWART BRYAN
President of William and
Mary College

E. G. SWEM
Librarian, William and
Mary College

BOOKS IN THE SOUTHERN BIOGRAPHY SERIES

FELIX GRUNDY—Champion of Democracy

By Joseph Howard Parks

xi, 368 pages. Cloth. Illustrated

\$3.00

EDWARD LIVINGSTON—Jeffersonian Republican and Jacksonian Democrat

By William B. Hatcher

xvi, 518 pages. Cloth. Illustrated

\$3.50

THOMAS SPALDING OF SAPELO

By E. Merton Coulter

xii, 334 pages. Cloth. Illustrated

\$3.00

"FIGHTIN' JOE" WHEELER

By J. P. Dyer

xi, 417 pages. Cloth. Illustrated

\$3.00

Forthcoming

JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS—Planter-Statesman

By George Coleman Osborn

Spring, 1942

\$3.00

"PITCHFORK BEN" TILLMAN—South Carolinian

By Francis B. Simkins

Summer, 1942

\$3.00

GEORGE FITZHUGH—Propagandist of the Old South

By Harvey Wish

Fall, 1942

\$3.00

W. H. STEPHENSON • EDITORS • FRED C. COLE

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS
BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA

THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

●

PRESIDENT

ALBERT B. MOORE, University of Alabama

VICE-PRESIDENT

J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON, University of North Carolina

SECRETARY-TREASURER

JAMES W. PATTON, Converse College

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(In addition to the officers named above)

EX-PRESIDENTS

(For three years following expiration of their terms)

CHARLES S. SYDNOR, Duke University (1942)

FRANK L. OWSLEY, Vanderbilt University (1943)

BENJAMIN B. KENDRICK, Woman's College of the University of
North Carolina (1944)

MANAGING EDITOR

FRED C. COLE, Louisiana State University

ELECTED MEMBERS

MINNIE CLARE BOYD, Mississippi State College for Women (1942)

FLETCHER M. GREEN, University of North Carolina (1942)

OTIS C. SKIPPER, The Citadel (1943)

WILLIAM M. ROBINSON, JR., Norfolk Navy Yard (1943)

WILLIAM C. BINKLEY, Vanderbilt University (1944)

BERNARD MAYO, University of Virginia (1944)